

# RESTORATION QUARTERLY

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP

Vol. 3, No. 2  
2nd Quarter, 1959

## EDITOR

J. W. Roberts, Abilene Christian College  
Box 173, Station ACC; Abilene, Texas

## EDITORIAL BOARD

Batsell Barrett Baxter, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee  
William M. Green, University of California, Berkeley 4, California  
Reuel Lemmons, Editor *Firm Foundation*, Box 77, Austin, Texas  
Joe Sanders, David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tennessee  
J. D. Thomas, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas  
Jack P. Lewis, Harding College, School of Bible and Religion, Memphis, Tennessee

BUSINESS MANAGER: Pat Harrell, P. O. Box 45,  
Natick, Massachusetts

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY: Abe Malherbe, Box 144,  
Lexington, Massachusetts

Contributions are invited. Manuscripts and communications for the *Quarterly* should be addressed to the editor. MSS should be typewritten, double-spaced, and proof-read before submitted. Notes and appropriate references may either be at the end of the articles or at the bottom of pages. Hebrew and Greek words should be transliterated. A biographical sketch should accompany each new contributor's work. No manuscripts will be returned, except when accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Books for review should be sent to *Restoration Quarterly*, P. O. Box 45, Natick, Massachusetts.

Subscriptions and business correspondence should be sent to the Business Manager, P. O. Box 45, Natick, Massachusetts.

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Regular	Students
One Year \$4.00	One Year \$3.00
Single Copies \$1.25	

## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	50
The Sinlessness of Jesus—Olan L. Hicks .....	51
The Virgin Birth of Christ—John McRay .....	61
Daily Life As Evidenced in the Papyri—J. D. Thomas .....	72
"Gone to the Christian Church"—The Editor .....	79
A Further List of Theses Written by Members of the Church of Christ .....	84
Notes on Recent Happenings and Contributions .....	88

## REVIEW OF BOOKS

Renwick: <i>The Story of the Church</i> —Pat Harrell .....	91
Stibbs: <i>The First Epistle General of Peter, Tyndale Commentary Series</i> —Pat Harrell .....	91
Blaiklock: <i>The Acts of the Apostles, Tyndale Commentary Series</i> —Pat Harrell .....	91
Ferm: <i>The Psychology of Christian Conversion</i> —Pat Harrell .....	92
Small: <i>Design for Christian Marriage</i> —Pat Harrell .....	92
Pfeiffer: <i>Between the Testaments</i> —Pat Harrell .....	93
Parker: <i>Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God</i> —Pat Harrell .....	93
Bromiley: <i>Sacramental Teaching and Practice in the Reformation Churches</i> —Pat Harrell .....	93
Bruce: <i>The Defence of the Gospel in the New Testament</i> — Pat Harrell .....	94
Hershberger: <i>The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision</i> — Pat Harrell .....	94
Bowie: <i>I Believe in Jesus Christ</i> —Pat Harrell .....	95
Kretzman: <i>The Sign of the Cross</i> —Pat Harrell .....	95
Fridy: <i>Adults at Worship</i> —Pat Harrell .....	95
Russell: <i>Teachers' New Testament with Notes and Helps</i> — Pat Harrell .....	95
Smith: <i>Minister's Library Handbook</i> —Pat Harrell .....	96
Ellison: <i>From Tragedy to Triumph</i> —Pat Harrell .....	96



## Introduction

Again those concerned with the publication of the *Restoration Quarterly* are grateful for the fine response being received. A recent mailing of a brochure brought many new subscribers and most of them wanted the back copies of the journal. We have exhausted the supply of the first number and have only a few of some others. The many expressions of appreciation are encouraging. We know that some of them are not deserved. Most of all, the help of those who produce articles is acknowledged. Without them there would be no *Quarterly*. We could only wish that many others who are capable of doing research and putting it into proper form would do so. A greater variety of articles and a wider choice of material are needed to make the production truly representative of our people.

*The McGarvey Award Repeated.* A friend of Abilene Christian College wishes to cooperate with the *Restoration Quarterly* to continue the McGarvey Award of \$100 for the best article submitted for the current year. The college plans to continue the award and in case of a tie as during the past year a duplicate award will be given. Those submitting articles should keep these points in mind. The article must (1) be objective. (2) Must not deal in personalities. (3) Must be scholarly, i.e., must be up to date in bibliography, not overly dependent on one book, must face a specific problem and handle it constructively. The award will be based upon merit in the judgment of the board. It is not designed as a popularity contest.

*Personalia.* Articles in the current number are selected to add variety to the material presented in the *Quarterly*.

Olan L. Hicks, who writes on the Sinlessness of Jesus is a member of the faculty at Freed-Hardeman College. Articles by him have appeared before.

John McRay is a member of the faculty at Harding College. He received his B. A. from David Lipscomb in 1954 and his M. A. from Harding in 1956. He has also done further graduate work at Vanderbilt University. His article on the Virgin Birth will be of special interest to the readers. While differing in its approach from some conservative treatments of the question, it has the virtue of taking the discussion out of the atmosphere of "Bible burning" into that of a consideration of the issues involved.

J. D. Thomas has been a contributor previously. He is a member of our board. His article on Daily Life as Evidenced in the Papyri has already drawn interesting comment—from the proofreader.

Other articles are self-explanatory. With reference to the Notes on Recent Happenings, it will be of interest to our readers that the next issue is to contain the first of two articles on Gnosticism, in which the current finds will be evaluated.

# The Sinlessness of Jesus

---

*Olan L. Hicks*

Recent discussions of the person and nature of Christ have had much to do with the question of His sinlessness. Until very recent times there was a reticence, in even the most radical circles, to cast any doubt upon the moral perfection of Jesus. Now, however, many writers and students question, even challenge, the possibility of the perfect sinlessness. It is argued, that though the highest degree of moral purity may be conceded to Jesus, sinlessness is impossible in this world. Nature has never in human experience produced a sinless personality. They fully recognize that if a sinless Being, such as Jesus is claimed to be, has really appeared in history, He is Divine, a marvel, only to be explained as a Miracle. The modern spirit, therefore, stumbles at such a Character, for He is a contradiction of its first principle—naturalism.

The many attempts to class Jesus with the sinful world have not generally met with favor. The facts have proved too mighty. For, if there is any one thing that stands out clearly among all the source materials we have concerning Jesus, it is the universal belief that he is sinless. This belief was firmly fixed in the minds of those whose writings have been passed down to us. His moral and religious teaching, which, so far from being derived from men, was in most instances at complete variance with the teaching and spirit of His age, was an evident token of His pure character. His life, both public and private, was holy and pure. He never at any time betrayed the slightest doubt of being in complete harmony with God. His unselfishness and love overflowed all the bounds of ordinary human narrowness and embraced all creatures. He claimed to be able to forgive sins, and to save sinners—claims, which if not in perfect keeping with His character, would at once have marked Him as the most presumptuous of imposters. His life is worthy of His most stupendous claims.

## The Testimony of His Contemporaries

It is the uniform testimony of those who were in any way qualified to know, that Jesus was sinless. This fact is more strongly affirmed by Peter and John than by any others. To Peter Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Mt. 16:16, 17). For him there was no other one to whom men might go; He alone had the words of eternal life. He was the holy One of God (John 6:68, 69), who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth (1 Peter 2:22, 23), a lamb without blemish and without spot (1 Peter 1:19), who suf-



ferred for sins, the righteous for the unrighteous (1 Peter 3:18). "And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). In the presence of Jesus' majestic person Peter saw himself as black contrasted with purest white—"Depart from me, O Lord," he cried, "for I am a sinful man!"

In this connection, the testimony of the Apostle John is no less emphatic. In fact, the chief reason assigned by the critics for rejecting the gospel of John is its portrayal of Christ as the marvelous Holy and Sinless One. Its transcendental character is its chief defect. The older critics urge that, whereas John presents a transcendental and altogether Holy Christ, the Synoptists present a strikingly human character, susceptible to sin and errors, with no intention of portraying a sinless character. Such sinlessness is only the invention of a later day, they urge. Happily, the trend in theological studies is definitely away from this view. John's estimate of Christ is briefly summed up in his first Epistle, as "Jesus Christ, the righteous" (2:1). Cf. 1 John 2:29. Stating the same fact negatively, he said: "Ye know that He was manifested to take away sins; in Him is no sin" (1 John 3:5).

No less effective than these, however, is the testimony of Judas when he tried to return the blood-money to the chief priests and elders, saying, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed innocent blood" (Mt. 27:4). Further, there is the ample testimony of those who were detached from Him, and whose witness was more or less incidental. Pilate could "find no fault in this just man," etc. (Mt. 27:24; Mk. 15:14; Lk. 23:4, 22; John 18:38; 19:4, 6, 12). His wife was deeply convinced that Jesus was not only a "just man," but her conscience troubled her that he was somewhat beyond a mere man (Mt. 27:19). One of the thieves, while readily confessing his own sins and worthiness of death, said, "This man hath done nothing amiss" (Lk. 23:41), and the centurion, was so overcome by the character which he had seen crucified that he "glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man" (Lk. 23:47), and, as Matthew further informs us, he and all who were with him "greatly feared," saying, "Truly this was the Son of God" (Mt. 27:54). Even the Jews who brought about His death gave unwilling testimony of the highest value to His supreme purity in their efforts to manufacture testimony to condemn Him. He did nothing which gave occasion to anyone—not even to the Prince of Evil (John 14:30)—to lay any charge of sin against Him.

The picture we have of Christ is of a character entirely God-centered, dominated by the passion of love toward all men, embracing the widest contrasts, always bearing Himself about in absolute freedom in relation to the world, to men and to events, uniformly victori-

ous in temptation, untouched by the least stain of base, paltry, or selfish motives. His entire portrait is such that we never feel even the least incongruity, not even when we see Him performing wonders, condemning sin as one having authority, or even, as God forgiving sins.

Certainly Jesus in all of His ministry displayed no consciousness of sin. In an unhealthy or abnormal mind it is conceivable that a man might mistakenly make such a claim. Yet it is the case among ordinary men that the more intelligent they are and the wider their experiences, the more sure they are of their own sins and imperfections. No other truly great man has ever felt as Jesus did, but exactly the opposite. In fact, the more men contemplate the deeper issues of life, the more prone they are to pronounce sinlessness impossible. Demosthenes attributed it only to the gods. Cicero had never seen or heard of a perfect man. Plato, in true philosophic style, dreamed of the Perfect man. Mohammed disclaimed sinlessness and prayed for forgiveness, and Socrates admitted his evil heart. As we turn to the Bible we find the same sense of sin in the greatest of its heroes.

Moses committed the offence of smiting the Egyptian, and otherwise showed himself a character far from perfect. Certainly he did not esteem himself as sinless, or make any claims to superior character. Isaiah in one of the most wonderful passages of the Old Testament confesses that he is a man of unclean lips, dwelling among people like himself (Isa. 6), and his predecessor, Elijah, who was in all their generations considered by the Hebrews one of their truly great prophets, despaired of his mission, not to say of his life, and declared himself no better than his fathers (1 Kings 19:4). Peter was blameworthy on many occasions; Paul confessed himself chief of sinners (1 Tim. 1:15), and John, the beloved disciple, went so far as to say, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (1 John 1:8).

### Jesus' Own Testimony

Thus far we have only considered the attitude of those who saw Jesus, and have said nothing of his own claims concerning himself. Much has been made by critics who deny the sinlessness of Jesus of His reply to the man who called Him "Good Teacher." "Jesus said unto him, 'Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God' " (Mk. 10:18). They contend that Jesus here disclaims any superior goodness. It is fairly clear, however, that Jesus even here only meant to emphasize that He was subordinate to the Father, Who is Absolute Good. It may even be His way of saying to the young man, "Do you indeed mean to recognize in Me what I really



am—God in the flesh?" At any rate, there are other statements which show that this was not meant as a denial of any claims to Holiness. As we hear Him say immediately after the young man had called Him "Good Teacher" that He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mk 10:45), we are convinced that He regarded Himself as sinless and capable of redeeming men to God. *He thereby distinguished Himself as Saviour from the world of sinners He came to save.* In the work of Christ, sinlessness is considered essential to His vicarious suffering. If he had been tainted with guilt, He would have been personally deserving of death and, therefore, in no position to die solely for the sins of others. He could not have condemned sin in the flesh. "Which one of you convicteth Me of sin?" (John 8:46) is not the boast of a blind and self-righteous fanatic. It is the deepest reaction of a soul possessed with absolute certainty that it is in harmony with God.

His claim, "I do always the things that are pleasing to HIM (God)" (John 8:29) is no less than claiming to be sinless at all times. "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd layeth down His life for the sheep," he said in the parable of the sheep-fold. This is simply another way of saying, "I am come as Saviour as distinguished from sinners to be saved." In the same kind is His invitation, "Come unto Me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly of heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls" (Mt. 11:28, 29). But even more striking is the claim of the preceding verse: "All things have been delivered unto Me of My Father; and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him" (Verse 27). No claim could be more presumptuous if not true. Many other similar claims or implications are to be found in the actions and statements of Jesus Himself.

### Testimony of Succeeding Age

Though it cannot be considered anything in the nature of conclusive evidence, it is nevertheless, of highly corroborative value to observe what was the testimony of those who had not been associated with Jesus but recorded the evaluation of Him which was current in the generation following His death. To Paul He was the one "who knew no sin" (2 Cor. 5:21), and to the writer of the Hebrew letter He was the Great and Perfect High Priest of Christians, who can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities; One who has been tempted in all points, yet without sin (4:15), such a High Priest as altogether befits every need of humanity—Holy, Guileless, Undeiled, Separated from sinners (7:26).



We have seen (1) that those who were associated with Jesus, friends and foes alike, received and attested the same impression; that (2) the closest scrutiny, His life reveals no moral imperfections; that (3) He was at no time conscious of any sins in His own person; that (4) He made claims which were tantamount to claiming sinlessness, and (5) that it was the conception of Him current in the generation after His death. We shall have occasion later to examine further the significance of some of these topics.

### Implicit Evidences of Jesus' Sinlessness

Let us now return briefly to the question of Jesus' own consciousness of sinlessness. As we have seen, the Synoptists are as explicit at this point as is the Gospel of John. Their implicit information, however, is just as convincing, if not more so, due to its very incidental nature. We have only to recollect the facts of His life in which His regard of Himself is demonstrated—how He began His Mission with a call to repentance, how He condemned the most righteous of His day, and that He urged confession of sins upon His followers. On the other hand, we never read of anything akin to contrition or confession of sins from Him. He stood among men without any consciousness of taint or sin—without fear or shame in the light of God. No scars of past sins are present, nor any remembrances of defeat. He neither confesses nor repents. He made it His highest duty to dispel erroneous impressions; surely He was not duped with regard to His own condition; and no man, not even the most rabid critic, has accused Him of hypocrisy.

When we couple with this the fact that on nearly every page of the Gospels we meet with His imperial demands for obedience as well as His gracious promises of help and pardon, such as would have been an enormity for a sinful man to pronounce, we are overwhelmed with the implicit evidence that Jesus was not only at no time conscious of sins, but that His disciples shared in the belief that He was a sinless character. It is not conceivable that those who went in and out and companied with Him from the beginning could have been either deceivers or deceived; for, in the one case, they would have lacked the moral integrity, and in the other the moral discernment, necessary to conceive or to present the ideal to us as a reality.

The accusations brought by those who are accustomed to deny the sinlessness of Jesus are patent. They have to do with such actions as His cleansing the Temple, His harsh denunciation of the Pharisees, His behavior toward His mother and His brethren, the entrance of the demons into the swine at Gadara, the cursing of the fig-tree, His answer to the Syrophoenician woman, and other similar occurrences, all of which furnish no real barrier to faith when a reasona-

ble and sympathetic study is made of them. In addition to these, it is also patent for those who deny to Him such sinlessness to urge that Jesus' submission to baptism was His way of disclaiming sinlessness. This, however, is pure assumption. Rather, it is apparent that Jesus came after "all the people were baptized." He Himself also was baptized that He might identify—associate—Himself fully with the people He had come to save. By it he stamped approval on baptism as a part of "righteousness." It formed the signal step in His self-dedication to the great Messianic task of bringing in the Kingdom of God.

### The Significance of Jesus' Sinlessness

The sinlessness of Jesus is a matter vaster in its ramifications than mere innocence. He knew sin for what it was. "He was tempted"—and we need not say one further word to justify our belief that the perfection of Jesus was more than those of the cloistered monk. As we have seen, Jesus eschewed the application to the epithet, "Good" to Himself. God only is good in the absolute sense, and therefore, can neither be tempted nor sin. Herein Jesus' sinlessness differs from "Good," as absolute, exclusive, untemptable and infallible. On the other hand, holiness is conceived as the achievement and definition of a character that has learned obedience. Innocence is its basis and starting point and holiness is the end to be achieved. Yet, there is no supreme virtue attached to innocence as such. Innocence is simply the untried, the uninitiated, a potentiality, without positive qualities, which has as yet attained unto nothing, but may become anything—godlike or devilish, holy or evil. And this leads us directly to say of evil, that it is the complete opposite of holiness as regards both state and character, since it represents the end or result produced by the abuse of the potentialities of innocence, whereas holiness is the result of the right use of those same potentialities.

This view leads us to say that sinlessness differs from either "innocence" or "good," "holiness" or "evil." On this point, Dr. A. M. Fairbairn's remark is entirely pertinent:

The basis or starting point of sinlessness is innocence, as its end is holiness, which will be eminent and meritorious in the very degree it has been attained without lapse. And so sinlessness is the word which most fitly describes Jesus, etc.<sup>1</sup>

Jesus' sinless was an attainment, achieved by victory over repeated and acute temptations. His manhood is essentially one with ours, else it is mockery to speak of His having been tempted in all points, like as we are. His burdens were of the same kind as ours, and His

<sup>1</sup>*The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (N. Y.: Doran, 1902) p. 376.



temptations were no pretense. Those who speak of Jesus as being by nature holy, make His temptations unreal.

Dr. Fairbairn recognizes this difficulty, though his solution of it seems inadequate, in the following passage:

The Evangelists appear to conceive Jesus to be good both in nature and conduct. . . . But holy in what sense? Not in any sense that excluded liability to temptation, which implies not only the ability to sin, but susceptibility to sin's seductions. There is a distinction between an impeccable and a sinless nature; the impeccable is incapable of sinning; the sinless has the capacity to sin, but has not sinned.<sup>2</sup>

In that case, just as in the case of God, He could not have been tempted. We must conclude, then, that Jesus, however pure, was not by nature absolutely holy, else he could not have learned obedience. The sinlessness of Jesus, however, was fulness and positive perfection of life—life at full tide. His character was not that of a sweet and benign complacency which sits aloof and broods over the metaphysics of life. His was no escaping from or toning down of the problems of life. He entered heartily into all the affairs of men, without reserve and without fear of being sullied by contact with them. He entered into the conflict of men's souls against sin, and by His victory over sin proved Himself to be the Redeemer by the achievement of the perfect life. He became the "tried stone" worthy to become the foundation of God's spiritual house. "He learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and having been made perfect, he became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him" (Heb. 5:8).

From the beginning of His ministry, Jesus had known the power and seductiveness of sin. He had felt temptation in its most exquisite allurements. Had He not opened up before Him at the very threshold of His labors, the path to easy victory? The longing for triumph, the impulse to take the shortest path to power, and the fear of death, under which all ages have dwelt—these and a host of other evils supplied Jesus with manifold opportunities to rebel. The holiness of Jesus was no automatic necessity of His being; He achieved it through suffering and pain and strength of heart. And while His life became a sacrifice, it became also a goal, an example, and our greatest source of encouragement. "Since the children are sharers of flesh and blood, He also Himself partook of the same" (Heb. 2:14) and not only shared of flesh and blood but also of the perils common to our humanity. Though temptation with Him had no appeal to the frailty of members weakened by previous sins, it was nevertheless not lacking in painful effort. However sinless a man may be, he is not thereby exempted from the keen and cruel warfare

---

<sup>2</sup>*Op. Cit.*, p. 375.

of temptation, and in the case of Jesus, none was ever so subtly tempted or triumphed through such agony. Truly, He can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities. In Jesus we can see presented such a true, if exceptional, humanity that we in turn are constrained to agree that here is indeed the Son of man, as well as the Son of God.

The true manhood of our Saviour is of fundamental significance to the whole Christian system: (1) *It assures us of a veritable incarnation, not an unreal make-believe.* The measure of His humanity is the measure of God's love for man. He is God expressing Himself in terms of our own experience and understanding. (2) *It provides the essential basis for atonement.* Our only true ideas of atonement grow out of some view of Jesus as identified with humankind to live and die for man. If He who died for man had been only man in seeming, or in part, then no expiation on our part would have been made. Only He can go before God for man, who goes from man's side, and without sin. In this respect, Christ became our fellow man, moved as true man through obedience, conflict, and death to procure our reconciliation with the Father. "He saw of the travail of His soul and was satisfied." (3) *It secured a real example of perfect humanity.* Just here the sinlessness which had seemed so far removed from us, as to make impossible abiding sympathy between us, disappears, overwhelmed by the evidence of His true humanity, which becomes to us the very nerve and spring of our hope. Abstract teaching and truth may lack the power to sustain the will but when we see the Word made Flesh and dwelling among men perfect righteousness is placed within the range of our own experience. (4) *And, lastly, He reveals to us our eternal destinies.* In His identity with us, and ours, in turn, with Him, we are to enter into the fulness of the redeemed. We do not know what we shall be like, but we know that we shall be like Him, and see Him as He is. His triumph is our surety.

The manhood of Jesus, . . . . is a distinctively human phenomenon, moving always within the lines of an authentically human mind and will, and constituting thus a revelation of God in humanity, "not partly in it and partly out of it." Yet it is just when this has been made clear that we adequately realise the wholly exceptional quality of this human life. Jesus may be described as ideal or normal man; but these just epithets produce a totally wrong impression if we do not add immediately that manhood of this ideal type has existed but once in history. He is unique in virtue of His sinlessness—the one quite unspotted life that has been lived within our sinful race.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>H. R. Mackintosh, *The Doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ*. (London, T & T Clark, 1913, 2nd Ed.) pp. 400f.



## Sinlessness of Jesus Involves Only Part of His Nature

In presenting the evidence for the sinlessness of Jesus we have been developing only one line of the great scriptural picture of our Saviour. We are fully aware of the fact that Jesus was viewed by all the New Testament writers, not only as a man but as divine. He is not an angel, not a paragon, but is both the son of man and the Son of God. It is not easy for us to see how there could be such a conjunction of the human with the divine in one person. Jesus was not partly God and partly man, He was one being, one personality.

The person of Jesus does not come apart in our hands into the two halves of humanity and divinity, one of which we have to set on one side when we begin to examine the other. His personality is a seamless whole.<sup>4</sup>

There is ever the possibility of seeking to achieve simplicity or of winning an argument at the expense of overlooking related evidence. In viewing the character of Jesus, it has been possible under varying prompting conditions for men to seek the easy solution of the problem by simply shutting their eyes to some of the evidence. The Ebionites held Jesus to be truly man but not God; while the Docetics took the reverse position and held Him to be God, and not man at all—only seeming to be, His appearances being only a matter of phantom or seeming. Arius conceived of Jesus as neither fully God nor fully man, but something in between. This compromise position indeed proved so popular that it almost captured the early church. Apollinarius, combatting Arianism, emphasized the deity of Christ and solved the problem by making Jesus a man as regards His body and animal life, but making His soul the divine Logos, i.e., he thought of Jesus as human in bodily form, but divine in mind and soul. To achieve these views it was necessary to ignore or do violence to much of the evidence.

The Gospel pictures for us One who was completely human and completely divine, not a split personality . . . in denying that Jesus has not the highest part of man's nature Apollinarius struck at His attending work just as effectively as did Arius. If Jesus did not take our nature upon him how can he redeem us.<sup>5</sup>

The Nestorians emphasized the manhood of Jesus, and, while they did not overlook His deity, they thought of it, however, as the indwelling of the divine in the man Jesus. Eutyches thought of Jesus as having both divine and human natures, but was sure that the human had been all but completely swallowed up in the divine.

---

<sup>4</sup>H. E. D. Turner, *Jesus Master and Lord*, (London, Mowbray, 1953) p. 185.

<sup>5</sup>Leon Morris, *The Lord From Heaven*, (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1958, Pathway Books) p. 111.

None of these false views, however, is involved in our study of the sinlessness of Jesus. The sinlessness of Jesus involves a study of Him as man identified with man.

### The Uniqueness of Jesus

Truly, Jesus is unique in the world. He is the prototype of righteousness, sinlessness. We can readily see how His character has no counterpart in the history of the world, neither in its originality nor its universality. That untutored Orientals could have invented a character of such proportions is as difficult to believe as that Jesus was what they represent Him to have been—altogether original. Furthermore, His character, while certainly within the "bourne off time and place" was not limited to any particular time or locality. He was universal in His love for men and in His appeal to them. His character appeals to the Occidental as greatly as to the Oriental, and wherever it is held up, it draws men unto itself.

The sinlessness of Jesus has given the world a new lease on life. The power of His character has found its way into all the corners of the earth, and wherever it has gone it has created among men a profound consciousness of sin. With this consciousness, however, it has graciously brought the release of forgiveness and the hope of eternal life. "Everyone that hath this hope set upon him, purifieth himself even as He is pure."



# The Virgin Birth of Christ

John McRay

Recent discussions<sup>1</sup> on the Revised Standard Version translation of Isaiah 7:14 have revealed an emphasis on the *birth* of Christ (perhaps even to the neglect of His conception). "People have become more attracted to the word *virgin* than to the child miraculously conceived of her."<sup>2</sup> For this and other reasons<sup>3</sup> undue criticism has been levied against those who have produced this most recent widely accepted translation of the Bible.<sup>4</sup> Criticism has ranged from linguistic error to "modernism."<sup>5</sup>

Without condoning the viewpoints held by members of the Revision Committee nor in every respect the translation produced, it should in fairness be stated that the intention in producing the version was to provide an accurate translation in modern language.<sup>6</sup> Strict ad-

---

<sup>1</sup>Edward J. Young, "The Immanuel Prophecy," *Westminster Theological Journal*, XV (1953), 97-124. Edward J. Young, "The Immanuel Prophecy," *Ibid.*, XVI (1953), 23-50. Cyrus H. Gordon, "Almah in Isaiah 7:14," *The Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXI (1953), 106. Ernest R. Lacheman, "Forum: Apropos of Isaiah 7:14," *Ibid.*, XXII (1954), 43. Alfred Von Rohr Sauer, "The Almah Translation in Isaiah 7:14," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, XXIV (1953), 551-559. James M. Bulman, "The Virgin Birth in Recent Discussion," *The Review and Expositor*, LI (1954), 470-494. Dale Moody, "The Miraculous Conception," *Ibid.*, 495-507. William A. Mueller, "Karl Barth's View of the Virgin Birth," *Ibid.*, 508-521. Dale Moody, "On the Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ," *Ibid.*, L (1953), 453-462. These are only to cite a few.

<sup>2</sup>Moody, *Review and Expositor*, L (1953), 458.

<sup>3</sup>Adherence to popular definition of "virgin" for example.

<sup>4</sup>This is not to include such work as is currently being done by noted men of scholarship (J. B. Phillips and others). Rather is intended the most recent efforts to supercede the King James Version with another "Authorized" (by National Council of Churches of Christ in America) version in modern terminology (See *Introduction to Revised Standard Version of The Old Testament*, Luther A. Weigle, chairman, (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952), p. 7.

<sup>5</sup>Bulman, *Review and Expositor*, LI (1954), 481-488. J. Ridley Stroop, *What Shall We Do with The New Bible?* (Nashville: J. Ridley Stroop, Publisher).

<sup>6</sup>"The Bible translator is not an expositor; however pronounced his views about Biblical doctrines, he has no right whatever to intrude his opinions into the translation, or to permit his dogmatic convictions to qualify or shape its wording. His one responsibility and that is absolute, is to render the Biblical meaning as *accurately and as effectively as is possible into appropriate English.*" Weigle, *Introduction to R.S.V. of the Old Testament*, p. 14.

herence to this purpose was not maintained throughout, however.<sup>7</sup>

The Virgin Birth of Jesus is not denied by the translators as being a New Testament Doctrine, which is clearly evident from their rendering *parthenos* "virgin" in the New Testament Translation.<sup>8</sup> It was simply felt that the Hebrew *Almah*<sup>9</sup> would best be translated by the English "young woman."

A great deal of ink has been spilled over the linguistic problems connected with this translation<sup>10</sup> as well as the theological significance of the doctrine itself<sup>11</sup> but perhaps the truth of the matter does not stand or fall on the basis of linguistic considerations. J. J. Grescham Machen, whose work *The Virgin Birth of Christ* remains unsurpassed both in presenting the case for the Virgin Birth and as a compendium of source material, does not depend upon linguistic arguments to establish his case. His work, rather, is conspicuously barren of Hebrew and Greek terminology. He does not feel that conservatism in Biblical interpretation demands a rendering of "Virgin" for *Almah*.<sup>12</sup>

Liberalism may be answered in this matter "with vigorous logic and real faith"<sup>13</sup> on the basis of considerations other than linguistic. However, the ultra-conservatism of Pope Pius VI is hardly the answer to be expected.<sup>14</sup> To this we shall consign ourselves in later paragraphs.

While a satisfactory conclusion to the question of the Virgin Birth is not dependent upon a knowledge of Greek or Hebrew, there are points of interest in the original languages. Why, one might ask, does the Septuagint (Greek Version of the Old Testament made in

---

<sup>7</sup>While adhering closely to the primitive meaning of *Almah* in Isaiah there was apparently no effort to do so with *Baptidzo* among other words; for which, it should be stated, Mr. Weigle could not give linguistic foundation. See footnote 8 below.

<sup>8</sup>Luke 1:27. Assurance on this point was given by Luther A. Weigle, chairman of Revision Committee on both Old and New Testaments, in a personal conversation at Yale University, 1956.

<sup>9</sup>Isaiah 7:14

<sup>10</sup>See footnote 1 above

<sup>11</sup>James Orr includes in the appendix to his work 18 articles by 17 authors on the Virgin Birth. *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1907), pp. 236-295.

<sup>12</sup>J. Grescham Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 297. (N.Y.: Harper and Bros., 1930), Compare Moody, *Ibid.*, L (1953), 453f.

<sup>13</sup>Moody, *Ibid.*, 455.

<sup>14</sup>"Condemnation of an author who denied that the Emmanuel prophecy referred to Christ in any sense, either literal or typical." *Enchiridion Biblicum* (Rome: 1927) no. 59, cited in the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, VIII (1946), 370.



the 3rd century B.C.)<sup>15</sup> which was produced by the Jews<sup>16</sup> use *Parthenos*, the specific Greek word for "virgin"<sup>17</sup> in translating Isaiah 7:14 from a text in Hebrew (their own language) which has *Almah*,<sup>18</sup> the generic word for "young woman"?<sup>19</sup> Admittedly the Greeks had a word for "young woman"<sup>20</sup> and the Hebrews had one for "virgin."<sup>21</sup> The answer may lie as C. C. Torrey thinks in the fact that there was no rigid difference in the Hebrew and Greek. He feels, and probably rightly so, that "*Parthenos* is the only pre-Christian interpretation of *Almah* of which we have knowledge."<sup>22</sup> Further, the linguistic difference is not too great between the *Masoretic* and *Septuagint* texts when we stop to consider that the Greek *Parthenos* is rather loosely used in the *Septuagint*. Of the approximate 65 times it occurs in the Greek Old Testament and Apocrypha it represents the Hebrew *Almah*, *Na'arah*, and *Bethulah*.<sup>23</sup>

The freedom employed in the use of *Parthenos* in the *Septuagint* may be seen in Genesis 34:3 where Dinah is so called after she has been raped by Schechem. Consequently the validity of Machen's statement that if we seek belief in the Virgin Birth merely in the *Septuagint* translation of *Almah* by *Parthenos* we are "venturesome in the extreme,"<sup>24</sup> could hardly be denied.

Little point would be made in expanding the arguments for and against the *Septuagint* rendering of Isaiah 7:14 since the word is so flexible in its applications. However, it is interesting that Cyrus Gordon thinks he has found an agreement with the Greek Version in a pre-Isaianic and pre-Mosaic clay tablet from Ugarit dating

<sup>15</sup>*Septuaginta*, ed. Alfred Rahlfs, (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950), Vol. I, p. XXII.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, p. XXIII

<sup>17</sup>Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. & ed. by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 632.

<sup>18</sup>*Biblia Hebraica*, ed. Rud. Kittel, (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937), p. 618.

<sup>19</sup>William Gesenius, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon*, ed. by Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, trans. by Edward Robinson, (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1939), p. 761.

<sup>20</sup>Compare *Neas*, Titus 2:4 *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. D. Eberhard Nestle, (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1952). For meaning consult Bauer, *Lexicon*, pp. 537-538.

<sup>21</sup>*Bethulah*, Gesenius, *Lexicon*, p. 143.

<sup>22</sup>C. C. Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), p. 48.

<sup>23</sup>Edwin Hatch, and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint*, (Graz: Austria, Akademische Druck-U. Verlangsanstalt, 1954), Vol. II, p. 1070.

<sup>24</sup>Machen, *Virgin Birth*, p. 297.

around 1400 B.C.<sup>25</sup> This alleged agreement, it should be remembered is yet only "alleged," but if it were certain, the question of the Virgin Birth would not be substantially affected, if at all.

The argument then that *Parthenos* is a substitution by Christians or to borrow Orlinsky's phrase a "Christological element"<sup>26</sup> introduced into the *Septuagint* Text is built upon a completely unsubstantiated narrowness of definition and can be maintained only by insisting upon one meaning of the word. Rahlfs' judgment is rather to be accepted that the word "justifiably originated in Old Jewish translators."<sup>27</sup>

Whether Matthew<sup>28</sup> and Luke<sup>29</sup> depended upon the *Septuagint* or not is a matter of comparative insignificance with reference to the message intended to be conveyed (since the use of *Parthenos* and *Almah* cannot be confined to any one definition<sup>30</sup>). Torrey's statement that Matthew 1:23 differs from the *Septuagint* "at every point in which difference was possible,"<sup>31</sup> however, needs to be "diluted" a bit. If Matthew *were* following a Hebrew text, there could very well have been a difference in his rendering of this *possible* and *important* point.<sup>32</sup> His use of *Parthenos* is strong evidence for a *Septuagintal* familiarity. This is strengthened if Machen's statement be true that:

There is not the slightest direct evidence, therefore, in support of the view that there was in the pre-Christian Judaism of the time subsequent to the Old Testament any expectation of a virgin birth of the Messiah.<sup>33</sup>

The teaching of Jesus Himself to Matthew would have been sufficient to cause him to prefer a *Septuagintal* reading in his work as also would Mary's instruction to Luke.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Gordon, *Journal of Bible and Religion*, "Almah in Isaiah 7:14," XXI (1953), 106.

<sup>26</sup>Harry Orlinsky, *Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament*, p. 30.

<sup>27</sup>Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, II, p. XXIII. Though he feels the word too be also "justifiably inaccurate."

<sup>28</sup>Matthew 1:23

<sup>29</sup>Luke 1:27

<sup>30</sup>Regardless of Cuthbert Lattey's insistence that there is no instance in which *Almah* is applied to a woman already married. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, IX (1947), p. 89.

<sup>31</sup>Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, p. 48.

<sup>32</sup>*Nea* rather than *Parthenos*.

<sup>33</sup>Machen, *Virgin Birth*, p. 297.

<sup>34</sup>"... he does not leave it doubtful whose authority he believed himself to have. 'His mother kept all these sayings in her heart'; 'Mary kept all these sayings hid in her heart,' 2:19,51." W. M. Ramsay, *Was Christ Born At Bethlehem?* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1898), p. 74. This is quite reasonable.

Further, it should be noticed that the place of *Parthenos* in the text of both Matthew and Luke is undisputed. (cf. Nestle's text.<sup>35</sup>) This supports the idea that they were rendering the common conception of the word and applying it to this messianic passage. There hasn't been sufficient evidence to warrant Theodore Zahn's view that Matthew wrote in Hebrew (i.e. cognate Aramaic.)<sup>36</sup>

Another point of linguistic interest is the word *gennao* used in Matthew's genealogy<sup>37</sup> in stating the birth of Jesus. There are several variants but the word undoubtedly occupies a place in the text and undoubtedly the passive is the correct form.<sup>38</sup> It is applied with equal liberty to Jacob's begetting Joseph and to Jesus' being born of Mary.<sup>39</sup> Obviously little more is meant here than that Jesus was born of woman<sup>40</sup> as were those whom He came to redeem.<sup>41</sup> He was worthy to redeem because He was the Son of God and He was able to save because He became a man in two essential respects: 1) born of woman, 2) born under law.<sup>42</sup>

This leads to a question of interest: "What is the relation of the Virgin Birth to the Incarnation?" James Orr may be somewhat narrow in his statement that "no one alleges that the Virgin Birth was the ground of the Apostolic belief in the incarnation,"<sup>43</sup> for while there may be no explicit statement of the doctrine by the Apostles<sup>44</sup> it is quite obviously the foundation of the Christian belief in

<sup>35</sup>Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

<sup>36</sup>Theodore Zahn, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Eng. trans. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909), Vol. II. p. 517.

<sup>37</sup>Matthew 1:16: *Marias, eks es egennethe Tesous*.

<sup>38</sup>Nestle, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (critical apparatus). Compare Vincent Taylor's *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*, (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1920), p. 114. He feels that all the readings preserve the Virgin Birth. Compare A. T. Robertson, *The Biblical Review*, XI (1926), p. 351 "We have to rest content with this conclusion for the present." "The weight of evidence is for the accepted text." 353

<sup>39</sup>See RSV & early Versions.

<sup>40</sup>Galatians 4:4; Romans 1:3 "Seed of David according to the flesh" can mean no more than this. See also Bauer, *Lexicon*, p. 154.

<sup>41</sup>This point is discussed at length in two rather old journals: J. W. McGarvey, "Paul and the Virgin Birth of Jesus," *The Bible Student and Teacher*, I, 1, (1904), p. 105. J. S. T. Milligan, "The Virgin Birth and Tribal Relation of Jesus," *Ibid.*, VIII, p. 183). William G. Moorehead, *Ibid.*, VIII, p. 407.

<sup>42</sup>Galatians 4:4.

<sup>43</sup>Orr, *Virgin Birth*, p. 189.

<sup>44</sup>*Loc. cit.*



the incarnation of Christ.<sup>45</sup> Yet the issue continues to be a part of the theological controversy.<sup>46</sup>

Undoubtedly the incarnation and Virgin Birth both play a secondary role to the resurrection in the Apostolic polemics for the divinity of Christ.<sup>47</sup> It would be foolish to argue from this that the Virgin Birth would be rejected while the resurrection would be accepted by Apostolic audiences.<sup>48</sup> The reasons, we may conclude, for the apostles' appealing to the resurrection more than to the birth are quite obvious: 1) The incarnation and Virgin Birth would have been ineffectual without the resurrection. 2) It was the strongest evidence to which the Apostles could appeal.<sup>49</sup> There was only one witness to the Virgin Birth (Mary) and she of all people would have reason to defend her own reputation by false testimony if the event were not true. On the other hand, the resurrection was testified by so many witnesses that it "was the most indisputable fact in the whole career of Jesus."<sup>50</sup> Certainly a "gross blunder would have been committed had Paul put the incarnation where he does the resurrection."<sup>51</sup>

One might not be too far afield to affirm that a belief in the moral character Jesus as represented by the gospel writers is strong evidence both for His described "entrance into and exit from the world."<sup>52</sup> This might well be given more consideration than is commonly done.

This suggests an important issue. One must either accept or reject the accuracy of a writer in reporting the events of his Gospel. Ultimately the question of the Virgin Birth (as all other questions in the New Testament) must be considered on the basis of the integ-

---

<sup>45</sup>Matthew 1:20 "that which is conceived in her is of the *Holy Spirit*. . . (Italics mine, J.M.) he shall save the people from their sins." Note the affirmation: 1) Conception not human. 2) Mary not married—"Fear not to take her." 3) Child has power to save from sin.

<sup>46</sup>For a positive correlation see William A. Mueller's treatment of Karl Barth, "Karl Barth's View of the Virgin Birth," *The Review and Expositor*, LI (1954), p. 508. Dale Moody, "On the Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ," *Ibid.*, L (1953), p. 453. N. S. Wright, "The Virgin Birth the Only Explanation of the Connected History," *The Bible Student and Teacher*, IX (1908), p. 124. For a negative correlation see Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 189: "No one alleges that the Virgin Birth was the ground of the Apostolic belief in the incarnation. . . ." H. E. W. Turner, "The Virgin Birth," *The Expository Times*, LXVIII (1956), p. 12.

<sup>47</sup>This does not mean in any sense that the Virgin Birth was unknown.

<sup>48</sup>"Why not accept a unique beginning as well as ending?" Orr (quoting Robinson), *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 268.

<sup>49</sup>McGarvey, *Bible Student & Teacher*, I,1, p. 108.

<sup>50</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>51</sup>*Loc. cit.*

rity of the book. Actually, as Machen suggests, the authority of the Bible is in question.<sup>53</sup>

Attacks on the narrative center largely around the Hebraistic character of it and from my study have been directed mostly at Luke. The consensus of opinion among those rejecting a Lucan authorship is that the narrative was a later addition.<sup>54</sup>

A strong statement for a Semitic background to the Virgin Birth narrative is to be found in Paul Winter's article in a recent journal<sup>55</sup> in which he compares many passages in Luke with the *Septuagint* and *Massoretic Texts* concluding that Luke agrees more often with the latter than the former. A more reasonable position is to be found, it seems, in Nigel Turner's answer to Winter in a subsequent issue of this journal.<sup>56</sup> He feels that all "Hebraized Greek" is not necessarily "translation Greek." Having considered Turner's detailed comparison of the narrative section<sup>57</sup> this writer is ready to agree with his conclusion that though there is some greater increase in Hebraistic style here than elsewhere in the Gospel it is insignificant when compared with the increase found in the Prophets of the Old Testament over that in the Law, (which were probably translated next after the Law). The entire book of Luke may exhibit Semitisms and chapters 1-2, though differing somewhat, need not be thought radically divergent from the remaining 22 chapters.

Whether Luke used a Hebrew source or not, and whether this narrative is Semitic beyond the other chapters, does not and need not affect a common authorship. Efforts to build such a case against

---

<sup>52</sup>A. B. Bruce, *The Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1899), p. 352.

<sup>53</sup>Machen, *Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 386. "If therefore, the Virgin Birth be rejected, let us cease talking about the 'authority of the Bible' or the 'infallibility of Scripture,' or the like. . . . A man who accepts the virgin birth may continue to hold to the full truthfulness of the Bible; a man who rejects it cannot possibly do so. That much at least should be perfectly plain."

<sup>54</sup>Taylor, *The Virgin Birth*, p. 46. "The suspected verses represent a later insertion in the Gospel." Paul S. Minear, "The Interpreter and the Nativity Stories," *Theology Today*, VII (1950), p. 362. "They were written down, to be sure, by individual editors." H. L. MacNeill, "The Sitz In Leben of Luke 1:5-2:20," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXV (1946), p. 129. "In all probability he came across this material after writing his Gospel and added it to its first edition, Proto-Luke."

<sup>55</sup>Paul Winter, "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," *New Testament Studies*, I (1954), p. 111.

<sup>56</sup>Nigel Turner, *Ibid.*, II (1955), "The Relation of Luke i and ii to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke Acts," p. 100.

<sup>57</sup>Chapters 1 and 2 compared with 3-28, as well as with Paul and LXX.

a Lucan authorship are simply fodder for theological quibble. Actually Luke's accuracy as a historian is constantly being confirmed rather than doubted by archæological evidence.<sup>58</sup> One may not deny that there are theological aspects to the question of the Virgin Birth,<sup>59</sup> but the charge against Luke is fundamentally a historical one.

If, in this regard, it be thought that there is a discrepancy in the genealogy of Luke as compared with that of Matthew it might be well to consider Machen's solution.<sup>60</sup> Luke is tracing the physical descent of Joseph back to David while Matthew enumerates the heirs to the throne of David. Thus it is logical that Luke begins with Joseph and traces the family tradition while Matthew begins with David and gives successive heirs.<sup>61</sup>

While it is true that Jesus was to be a product of the tribe of Judah<sup>62</sup> and while, in all probability, Mary was of the tribe of Levi<sup>63</sup> this casts no doubt on the historical accuracy of Luke or Matthew because after their marriage<sup>64</sup> and before Jesus' birth<sup>65</sup> she would be considered of the tribe of Judah as was her husband Joseph.<sup>66</sup> In the same way Ruth, of Moab,<sup>67</sup> married Boaz of Bethlehem<sup>68</sup> and gave birth to Obed<sup>69</sup> who was considered to be of the tribe of Judah.<sup>70</sup>

Regarding canonical parallels it should be stated that Catholic efforts to establish a foundation of psychological correspondence between Mary and Old Testament prophecy are without convincing evidence.<sup>71</sup> There is some similarity between the Lucan narrative and Judges 6:11-24, but this does not prove a virginal preoccupation

---

<sup>58</sup>Henry J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955). A little older defense of Luke is Ramsay's *Was Christ Born At Bethlehem?*

<sup>59</sup>Though Wright does to a degree. N. S. Wright, *Bible Student and Teacher*, IX (1908), p. 124.

<sup>60</sup>Machen, *Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 207.

<sup>61</sup>Matt. 1:1-16; Luke 3:23-38

<sup>62</sup>Micah 5:2; Heb. 7:14; Rev. 5:5.

<sup>63</sup>Compare Luke 1:5 with 1:36.

<sup>64</sup>Marriage is clearly implied in Matthew 1:18,20.

<sup>65</sup>This fact is necessitated by the point under consideration—His birth into the tribe of Judah. Compare Heb. 7:14.

<sup>66</sup>Luke 1:23,33. Note: There is an interesting article on Mary in the 2nd century writers by Stephen Benko, *Religion in Life*, XXVI (1957), p. 98.

<sup>67</sup>Ruth 2:2

<sup>68</sup>Ruth 2:4 (For marriage see 4:13).

<sup>69</sup>Ruth 4:13,17.

<sup>70</sup>Compare Matthew 1:2-6; Luke 3:23-33. See further J. S. T. Milligan, *Bible Student and Teacher*, VIII (1908), p. 183.

<sup>71</sup>Christian P. Ceroke, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XIX (1957) p. 329.



of mind on the part of Mary. As a matter of fact one would expect to find similarity in a comparison of two announcement narratives.<sup>72</sup>

Efforts to find non-canonical parallels<sup>73</sup> as a basis for Luke's narrative have been without appreciable success. The closest parallel in non-canonical literature may be in the Buddhistic tradition but Boslooper points out enough differences to make that evidence of no effect.<sup>74</sup> From these differences one would conclude that the Christian account was not derived from the Buddhistic and if there is a similarity between them it may be seen more clearly in the Apocryphal tradition of "Pseudo-Matthew," "Protoevangelium," and "The Gospel of the Birth of Mary."<sup>75</sup>

In the Apocryphal and Buddhistic narratives there are similarities not to be found in the New Testament account.<sup>76</sup> There would, consequently, be little basis for demanding a dependence of the canonical on the non-canonical.

Though only Ignatius, among the *Apostolic Fathers*,<sup>77</sup> mentions the birth of Jesus, one may not conclude that it was unknown in these writers.<sup>78</sup> It seems more plausible that the resurrection had been of greater importance to their immediate problems and so it finds expression often.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup>Consider here again Machen's statement above (page 6, note 33) which has not been refuted.

<sup>73</sup>Consult following for discussion: Louis Matthews Sweet, *The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ*, (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1907), pp. 102-192. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 317-379. Taylor, *The Virgin Birth*, p. 1-20. Orr, *The Virgin Birth of Christ*, p. 151-182. Thomas Boslooper, *Religion in Life*, XXVI (1957), p. 87.

<sup>74</sup>Boslooper, *Ibid.*, p. 87.

<sup>75</sup>M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1955), p. 38f.

<sup>76</sup>1) Child chooses his mother before birth. 2) Mother is supreme among women. 3) White elephant or bird is symbol of conception. 4) Gem is analogy for unborn child. 5) Mother's pregnancy is without pain & discomforts. 6) Infant brilliant as the sun, pure at birth. 7) Wonders occur throughout the natural world. 8) He announces at birth who he is. 9) New born child received immediately with royal pomp and ceremony. Boslooper, *Religion in Life*, XXVI (1957), p. 87.

<sup>77</sup>"Ignatius to the Ephesians," "Ignatius to the Smyrneans," Kir-sopp Lake, trans., *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. I, pp. 193, 253.

<sup>78</sup>Writing at the turn of the first century.

<sup>79</sup>Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. I, pp. 51, 53, 161, 207, 254, 261, 333, 335. (Compare page 9 above).

<sup>80</sup>Justin Martyr, "Dialogue with Trypho," *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Roberts, Alexander and Donaldson, James, eds. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), I, p. 231, Chapter LXVI, LXVII.

The doctrine is known by Justin Martyr in the second century,<sup>80</sup> Origen in the third,<sup>81</sup> and Eusebius in the fourth.<sup>82</sup> Although some have urged that the Virgin Birth is not necessary to the Deity of Christ, it is usually discussed in this context by early writers. The Ebionites of Origen's writings were divided over the issue because the deity of Christ was at stake. The *existence* of the doctrine does not stand or fall upon this evidence but there is value in the fact that the doctrine occupied a place of controversy among those early writers.

The idea of a Virgin Birth is often rejected because it cannot be understood. It is contrary to reason. Is this to suggest that a "normal" childbirth *can* be understood? Rather, one simply accepts the process that is familiar and certainly taken for granted—that which falls within the realm of his own limited experience—but he does not understand *how* this is possible nor why it should even be considered possible.

The reproduction of plant life and its vital place in sustaining human life when consumed is no less mysterious nor more easily explained than miraculous—yet not denied. Until "normal" childbirth, then, shall be proven non-miraculous let it not be charged that "supernatural" childbirth is impossible because it is unreasonable. "Nature can reasonably be supposed to be the sort of being that could, or would, work miracles."<sup>83</sup>

Perhaps a rather lengthy quotation would not be out of place by one of the pioneers and recognized authorities of "natural childbirth."

When a child is born unhampered by the limitations we moderns put upon the natural laws, I am humbled before the miracle of birth and all the host of wonders that awake its mechanism. It lives, we do not know why, indeed we do not know the source of life itself. But here, from the indestructible forces of the universe, arrives a new human form. It is unlike any other we have ever seen, different in a thousand ways from its most similar brother. It has, however, the great common denominator of all humanity, Life, that inestimable gift which from the first moment is our responsibility—Life which arrives, is marred or magnified and passes on. . . . A new life, which of its very potential power is greater than death should be logically heralded with pride and joy.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>81</sup>Origen, "Origen Against Celsus," *Ibid.*, IV, p. 570, chap. LXI.

<sup>82</sup>Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, H. J. Lawlor and J. E. L. Oulton, trans., (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1927), I, p. 191, chap. VI, xvii, pp. 88, chap. III, xxvii.

<sup>83</sup>C. S. Lewis, *Miracles*, (London: Geoffrey Bles; The Centenary Press, 1947), p. 77. Editor's note: This seems to assume a wrong definition of miracle. Rather it should probably be said that until we understand what we term natural we should not deny the possibility of the supernatural.

<sup>84</sup>Grantly Dick-Read, *Childbirth Without Fear*, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953), pp. 130-131.

Turning now to the immediate problem, does the New Testament teach the Virgin Birth of Christ? Giving Matthew and Luke credit at least as competent historians (if not inspired men), there can be little doubt of an affirmative answer.

As this writer views the narrative, there are but three possibilities pertaining to the virginity of Mary. First, that she and Joseph were normally married before the annunciation with all the implications and privileges expected in such a relationship having been exercised. However, if this be true the phrase that "Joseph . . . knew her not,"<sup>85</sup> is without meaning or purpose. Equally as meaningless would be the phrase "before they came together."<sup>86</sup> Nor could the disappointing surprise of Joseph at her pregnancy be explained if they had been living as man and wife.<sup>87</sup>

A second possibility is that they were married but were not having physical, sexual relations. This position is maintained by those who would have Mary and Joseph to have agreed upon abstinence before their marriage<sup>88</sup> and is based on the phrase in Matt. 1:18: "Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together." But, if they were married there is no reason to conclude that she would have dedicated herself to a life of virginity *before* the annunciation. Why should she consider *herself* to be the object of Isaiah 7:14? Why should she alone consider the passage to be Messianic? Why should virginity necessarily be understood by *Almah* even if the passage were taken to be Messianic?<sup>89</sup> There is no evidence to support the theory that Mary lived a virginal life after marriage<sup>90</sup> and even less that she made such a pledge beforehand.

The third possibility is that Mary and Joseph were engaged but not married. This best fits all the demands of the context.<sup>91</sup> How else may we understand the words "fear not to take unto thee Mary . . ." for why should he not take her if he had already taken her for his wife? The phrase can admit of only two applications: 1) Marriage initially, or 2) Marital relationships. If the latter is accepted then Joseph took unto him Mary and performed the duties and privileges of a husband—which is immediately denied by verse 25 "and knew her not." By far the clearest and easiest of interpretations is that they were engaged but had not yet "come together," when Joseph was shocked at her pregnancy and was then told to take Mary because that which was conceived within her was through the Holy Spirit. He took her and knew her not till she had brought forth a son. That son was Jesus Christ, born of a Virgin.

---

<sup>85</sup>Matthew 1:24,25

<sup>86</sup>Matthew 1:18

<sup>87</sup>Matthew 1:19

<sup>88</sup>Cuthbert Lattey, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, IX (1947), p. 153.

<sup>89</sup>Compare page 6 above, note 33.

<sup>90</sup>See Mark 6:3 to the contrary.

<sup>91</sup>It fits also what is known of the Jewish custom best.



# Daily Life as Evidenced in the Papyri

J. D. Thomas

Though it is well over a century since the first papyri were found, more than a half century since some of the great "finds" and since interest in them increased, we have yet much to learn from them and, no doubt, many more are yet to be found. We now have "dated" non-literary papyri for every single year of the first century A. D.

The papyri discoveries are especially valuable in that they furnish information in areas otherwise unknown. Their assistance in the determination of the true character of the language of the New Testament and knowledge of its vocabulary is well known. They have also aided the study of textual problems and furnish an accurate picture of the environment of early Christianity. This latter help comes largely through the non-literary writings, which are distinguished by the very fact that they were written to a select group of readers and not for the public. These non-literary works include private letters of all sorts, official documents and correspondence, contracts, decrees, petitions, leases, wills, *et cetera*. We find medical prescriptions; magical charms; tax receipts, sales and other types of taxes; reports of court trials; petitions to the Epistates; order for arrest; complaints of assault; death, birth census and pauper records; marriage and divorce documents; priest's revenue returns; mortgages, bank loans; and an account list of a beer-seller. Thus we are enabled to see life as it actually was—to step as it were, out of twentieth century U. S. A. and back into first, second, or third century Oxyrhynchus and actually see and meet those people and hear them tell of their problems and tribulations.

Our purpose in this paper is to select pertinent materials from the vast supply, so as to present to New Testament students as accurate a picture as possible of *Family Life* in ancient Egypt, as an environmental factor of the early Christian movement.

The family seemed to be the social unit in ancient Egyptian Life, rather than the individual. Marriage contracts thus formed an important part of the satisfactory relationships of this social factor. A good example is this contract, dated 92 B. C.:

The year 22, Mecheir 11. Philliskos son of Appollonius, Persian of the Epigone, acknowledges to Appollonia also called Kellauthis, daughter of Heraclides, Persian, with her guardian her brother Appolonijs, that he has received from her in copper money two talents and four thousand drachmae, which is the dowry agreed upon by him for her, Appollonia. . . . The keeper of the contract is Dionysius. (The foregoing is in the first hand; then in the second hand—)

In the twenty second year of the reign of Ptolemy also called Alexander, the god Philometer, in the priesthood of Alexander's priest and of the rest as written in Alexandria, on the month Xandikos 11, Mecheir 11, at Kerkeosiris of the division of Polemon of the Arsinoite nome. Philiskos, son of Appollonius, Persian of the Epigone, acknowledges to Apollonia, also called Kel-lauthis, daughter of Heraclides, Persian, with her guardian her brother Appollonius, that he has received from her in copper money two talents and four thousand drachmae, the dowry agreed upon by him for her, Apollonia. Apollonia shall remain with Philiskos, obeying him as a wife should obey her husband, owning their property jointly with him. Philiskos, whether he is at home or away from home, shall furnish Apollonia with everything necessary and clothing and whatsoever is proper for a wedded wife, in proportion to their means. It shall not be lawful for Philiskos to bring home another wife in addition to Apollonia nor to have a concubine or boy-lover, nor to beget children by another woman while Apollonia is alive nor to maintain another house of which Apollonia is not mistress, nor to eject or insult or illtreat her nor to alienate any of their property with injustice to Apollonia. If he be shown to be doing any of these things or does not furnish her with what is necessary or clothing or the rest as stipulated, Philiskos shall immediately pay back to Apollonia the dowry of the two talents and four thousand drachmae of copper. In the same way it shall not be lawful for Apollonia to spend night or day away from the house of Philiskos without Philiskos' knowledge, or to have intercourse with another man or to ruin the common household or to bring shame upon Philiskos in whatever causes a husband shame. If Apollonia voluntarily wishes to separate from Philiskos, Philiskos shall pay back to her the bare dowry within ten days from the day it is demanded. If he does not pay it back as stipulated he shall immediately forfeit the dowry he has received plus one half. The witnesses are Dionysius, son of Patron, Dionysius, son of Hermaiskos, Theon, son of Ptolemaeus, Didymus, son of Ptolemaeus, Dionysius, son of Dionysius, Heracles, son of Diocles, all six Macedonians of the Epigone. The keeper of the contract is Dionysius. (Then follows in a third hand)

I, Philiskos, son of Appollonius, Persian of the Epigone, acknowledge that I have received the dowry, two talents and four thousand drachmae of copper, as written above, and I have deposited the agreement, which is valid, with Dionysius. Dionysius, son of Hermaiskos, the aforesaid, wrote for him since he is illiterate. (Then in the fourth hand)

I, Dionysius, have the contract which is valid. (Again, in the first hand)

Registered the year 22, Mecheir 11.<sup>1</sup>

This particular contract is quite lengthy, perhaps because of the amount of the dowry. In this case, it might be surprising that Philiskos was illiterate, however. The dowry was regular. Some cases of brother-sister marriages were known—thought to be illustrated

<sup>1</sup>Winter, J. G., *"Life and Letters in the Papyri,"* p. 119f

in the "Hilarion to Alis, his sister" papyrus, though this may have been a tender form of address.

Not all marriages were happy ones. "Writings of divorcement" are frequent—generally of a contractual nature, stipulating the amount of returned dowry, the fact of their making no future claims upon each other, sometimes mentioning the return of a "super-dowry" (over the regular amount), generally attributing the trouble to "some evil demon," and expressing a sort of disappointment that it had not worked out. There were complaints, too, of unhappy relationships that had not yet ended in divorce, as one dated 20-50 A. D.:

. . . But Sarapion, after he had squandered my dowry to suit himself, continually illtreated, insulted, and attacked me, deprived me of the necessities of life: finally he deserted me, leaving me in destitution. I therefore beg you to order him to be brought before you, in order that he may be compelled perforce to pay back my dowry plus a half. This petition is without prejudice to any other claims which I have or may have against him.<sup>2</sup>

Another instance is more severe, as to treatment by the husband, who maltreats the slaves and foster daughters to learn what the wife had done with his property; and vexed his wife's soul, criticizing her for going off to church and declaring: "After a month I am going to get myself a harlot."<sup>3</sup>

In addition to these *eggraphos gamos*, or recorded marriages, with their full legal obligations as to rights, property, *et cetera*, there was another type, *agraphos gamos*, legal but not recorded, in which the agreement was simply one of living together, which arrangement could be terminated by either party without penalties. It seems to have been expected from the outset to be only temporary, and might later result in an *eggraphos gamos*. The unrecorded marriages were generally set for a period of five months, and perhaps were prompted by passion, as magical incantations indicate, for example: "Cause Nike, daughter of Appolonous, to love Pantous whom Tmesios bore, for five months."

Parent-child relationships were, on the whole, normal. We find letters expressing tender solicitude both from child to parent and from parents to children. Because of the deep grief of Taonnophris and Philo over the loss of a child, their friend Irene consoles them, stating that she weeps over their child as she did her own Didymas.<sup>4</sup> Children had toys. Several dolls have been found in the excavations at Karanis, and some small wooden horses, mounted on wheels, with pulling strings, are now to be found in the Michigan Museum. One

<sup>2</sup>Winter, J. G., *op. cit.*, p. 126

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid*, p. 127 (4th C. A. C.)

<sup>4</sup>Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East*, p. 176 (2nd C. A. D.)



writer mentions sending eight toys for the "little Theon."<sup>5</sup> One Theonas was a rather tart little fellow, however:

Theon to Theon his father greeting. Thou hast done well. Thou hast not carried me with thee to the town. If thou wilt not carry me with thee to Alexandria. I will not write thee a letter, nor speak thee, nor wish thee health. But if thou goest to Alexandria, I will not take hand from thee, nor greet thee again henceforth. If thou wilt not carry me, these things come to pass. My mother also said to Archelaus. "he driveth me mad: away with him." But thou hast done well. Thou hast sent me great gifts,—locust beans. They deceived us there on the 12th day, when thou didst sail. Finally, send for me, I beseech thee. If thou sendest not, I will not eat nor drink. Even so. Fare thee well, I pray. Tybi 18.<sup>6</sup>

Illegitimate children are not on a social par with their fellows, there even being a law against registering their birth, in the public record. One Sempronia Gemella, caused "written testimonies" to be made of the birth of her illegitimate twins, because of this law.<sup>7</sup>

We are touched by the letter of Hilarion to Alis, in which he tells her to "cast out" her expected child at birth if it is female.<sup>8</sup> This is the only papyrus mentioning this practice, though there is other evidence, and a Christian condemnation of the practice. Frequently, cast out children were rescued from the "dung-heap" and put out to professional nurses to bring up. Wealthy people also used professional nurses, and we find many contracts stipulating the arrangements. One court trial considers the kidnapping of the child of a nurse, because the kidnapper thought the child was his, whom he had paid the woman to nurse. The nurse claimed that his child had died and that the living one was her own. The judge rendered his decision on the fact that the child favored the mother in looks, but he required the nurse to repay all monies received for her nursing services.<sup>9</sup>

Not all the Greeks were educated, nor all the Egyptians uneducated, though the education of the latter was largely limited to the priestly family and the well-to-do. There were no public schools, and the children were taught by tutors or by private schools. Many school exercises have been found and evidence of the study of Homer and Cicero are noted. Frequently there is mention in official documents that someone else other than the negotiating party had signed the document in his behalf, since he "did not know letters." Children of the poorer classes were put to work or into an apprenticeship as soon as possible.

---

<sup>5</sup>*P. S. I. IX*, (2nd or 3rd Cent.)

<sup>6</sup>Deissman, A., *op. cit.* p. 201f. (2nd or 3rd Cent. A. D.)

<sup>7</sup>Winter, J. G. *Ibid* p. 55 (145 A. D.)

<sup>8</sup>Deissman, *op. cit.* p. 167f (1 B.C.)

<sup>9</sup>Milligan, G., *Selections From the Greek Papyri*, p. 48 f (A. D. 49)

Such emotional experiences as we have today were also the lot of the ancient Egyptians. Sorrow, consolation, sympathy, contrition, affection and anxiety are all noted and are the result of life experiences such as ours of the present century—death, absence, guilty consciences, fears, love affairs, *et cetera*. They had their troubles and vicissitudes of life also, prompted by financial troubles, robberies, marital problems, and the like. Many sought relief from these ills by petitions to the authorities, or in court action.

As we turn to consider matters in the economic realm it may be interesting just here to note some references to food and eating:

For dinner on the 5th, A Canopic liver; for dinner on the 6th, 10 oysters, 1 lettuce; for dinner on the 7th, 2 small loaves, 1 fattened bird from the water, 2 snipe (?).<sup>10</sup> I received the fine flour which was good. Run over to the house lest my mother has need of anything. Give my regards to Pausition and Hermias and Heraclides and . . . and your brother's wives and the children and all those who love you. If you come upon any mustard relish, buy it and make pickle for us. If you are making anything good, make some extra for the brother's house. As for the rest, good-bye. The 13th year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, Epeiph 12.<sup>11</sup>

Slavery was a common thing, yet there were "superior" slaves that were considered highly by the family. We have several documents apparently written by slaves or former slaves, in terms of great endearment. One such is mentioned as the most sentimental writing among the papyri.

Manumission of slaves was frequent, often done in this manner: The slave would deposit his savings in the temple treasury. Then the owner would "sell" the slave to the god, receiving the money from the treasury, and the slave being henceforth the protege of the god. Strict regulations as to the fact that he could no more become a slave, especially to the former owner, were generally incorporated in the agreement.

Financial transactions were conducted through normal channels. There were banks, with deposit and loan facilities, mortgages, pawnshops, house-leases, land-leases, with payment in crops, *et cetera*. Of interest might be the letter of Melas relative to funeral expenses:

I paid him the costs of the carriage of the body amounting to three hundred and forty drachmas in the old coinage. I wonder exceedingly that you went off so cruelly, without taking the body of your brother, but that having collected all that he had you then went off. From this I learned that it was not on account of the dead man you came here, but on account of his

---

<sup>10</sup>Davis, W. H., *Greek Papyri, of the First Century*, p. 8 (A. D. 1)

<sup>11</sup>Davis, W. H., *Ibid*, p. 24 (A. D. 27)

goods. See to it therefore that you furnish the sums expended. The expenses are—the price of medicine 60 old drachmas, the price of wine on the first day, two choi 32 old drachmas, for outlay in delicacies and foods 16 drachmas, to the undertaker (for conveying the body) to the desert, in addition to the payment agreed upon, one *chous* (of wine) 20 drachmas, two choi of olive oil 12 drachmas, one artaba of barley 20 drachmas, the price of a linen cloth 20 drachmas, and of the cost (for the transport of the body) as is detailed above 340 drachmas. Total of the account for the whole outlay five hundred and twenty drachmas of the old coinage. Total 520 drachmas. . . .<sup>12</sup>

In considering the relations of the family to the State, we first think of the census rolls, the birth reports, the lists of the dead and lists of paupers. The census was taken every fourteen years and no doubt served for taxation purposes. It was to the family's advantage to duly make record of the dead, then, that the deceased might be no longer responsible for taxes.

The postal service is an interesting study. There was no public service, so the service was personal and often lacking. Along the main roads there were ample facilities and sufficient travel, but for out-of-the-way places it had to be seldom. Often an additional verbal message was delivered by the carrier. There was, of course, the Imperial Post which took care of the official mail, and which, we learn, operated very methodically. A papyrus of about 255 B. C. says:

Careful note is made of the day and hour of the arrival of each messenger, his name and that of the clerk who received and issued letters at the office, the number and addresses of the packets, and the names of the messengers to whom they were handed on.<sup>13</sup>

Of interest also is the matter of police protection, complaints, court trials and the like. Some serious complaints, as theft, assault, acts of violence, the cutting-off of vines, *et cetera*, brought in complaints that were no doubt real problems to the officials. It is interesting to note the tone of expectation of relief in the complaints:

They broke through a window which overlooks a public street and which had been blocked up with bricks, probably using a log as a battering-ram against the place. Then they entered the house through this window, and from what was stored in the house they carried away only ten artabae of barley. She inferred that this was let down piecemeal through the said window from the traces of rope upon it, a fact which she made known to the chief of police of the village and to the other officials. I am therefore compelled to submit this petition, and I beg you to order that the chief of police and the other officials be brought before you, and to make the necessary investi-

---

<sup>12</sup>Milligan G., *Selections* . . . pp. 119f (3rd-4th C. A. D.)

<sup>13</sup>Milligan, G., *Here and There* . . . pp. 115f



gation about the robbery which took place, to the end that I may be able to recover the barley.<sup>14</sup>

Social life and functions include invitations to dinners, to wedding feasts (which are usually for "tomorrow," and for the ninth hour (3 p.m.), and certain festivals. Witness this papyrus:

Antonius, son of Ptolemaeus, invites you to dine with him at the table of the lord Serapis in the house of Claudius Serapion on the 16th at nine o'clock.<sup>15</sup>

Health and medical attention was of course of interest to the family. We find hospitals mentioned in the fourth to sixth centuries, but earlier there are physicians. One doctor was before the court claiming immunity from some sort of public service because of his profession, and it was the task of the judge to determine his qualifications as a physician. The test was: "Tell me, if you are an authorized doctor, the solvent used for mummification, and you will receive the immunity."<sup>16</sup> Eye diseases were common, as Tryphon's cataract; a slave girl was certified as sound except for epilepsy and leprosy, and there were many recipes for headaches and fevers, including the use of charms.

To conclude this study of the section on Family Life as reflected in the papyri, one needs merely to say that very concretely they announce that human nature has not changed—people then were as people now, except for a different setting with different traditions.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Davis, W. H. *Greek Papyri of the First Century*, Harper and Bros. New York and London, 1933.
- Deissman, A. *Light From the Ancient East*, Tr by L. R. M. Strachan. 4th Ed. Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1927.
- Meecham, H. G. *Light From Ancient Letters*, New York, MacMillan Co., 1923.
- Milligan, Geo. *Here and There Among the Papyri*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1922.
- Milligan, Geo. *Selections From the Greek Papyri*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1927.
- Winter, J. G. *Life and Letters in the Papyri*, The Jerome Lectures Ann Arbor, Univ. of Mich. Press, 1933.

---

<sup>14</sup>Winter, J. G., *op. cit.* p. 110 (190 A. D.)

<sup>15</sup>Milligan, G., *Here and there* . . . p. 101f (2nd C. A. D.)

<sup>16</sup>Winter, J. G., *Ibid*, p. 130 (2nd C. A. D.)

## “Gone to the Christian Church”

Dr. Leroy Garrett, who is a professor of Philosophy at MacMurry College, Jacksonville, Ill., and who needs little introduction to most readers of the *Restoration Quarterly*, this year has begun a quarterly publication called *Restoration Review*. Two numbers have been received on exchange. The make-up and appearance of the journal are quite well done and we wish the editor success for the furtherance of truth.

The following excerpt from the pages of his first number will answer questions about the positions which we suppose may be expected from the *Review*. The quotation also reveals something of the theological position of the editor. He has, to say the least, moved a long way from positions which even he himself (we are sure) would admit were extreme to the point of radicalism.

It seems that one of his friends had heard rumors of changes along some lines and wrote: “I have heard that you have joined up with the Christian Church. I would like to get this matter straight.” To which the editor replies under the title “Gone to the Christian Church”:

It is shameful that the great brotherhood of disciples has become so divided. It has not only splintered into three major divisions (Disciples, Christian Church, and Church of Christ), but there is further fission within each of these. Yet we are the ones who plead for unity so adamantly. There is now a big question in my mind as to whether our pioneers were wise in breaking away from the established churches of their day. Perhaps it would be more consistent with our plea if we were a “fifth column” within the denominations working for restoration. Since Campbell’s day we have succeeded in adding three more denominations to those already existing with promises of still others to come. Our pioneers contended that they were not another denomination, but rather a “movement” within the body of Christ working for unity.

I have not “gone to the Christian Church” or “joined the Disciples” anymore than I have joined the Baptist Church or the Church of Christ. I am the Lord’s and I am a member of his body. This makes me a brother to all those in the church of Jesus Christ wherever they may be, and I suppose some are to be found in all religious communions. I work with and identify myself with any and all of the disciple churches because they are a part of the Restoration Movement, at least theoretically. This in no wise means that I agree with *everything* believed and practiced by any of the disciple groups. I think the “Church of Christ” group is wrong on many things, especially in their attitude, but I work with them and fellowship them just the same. I feel the same way toward the “Disciples” and the “Christian Church.” All these people are my brethren in the Lord and I love them. I am eager to have fellowship with them and to be one with them despite the fact

that there are serious differences. All this means that I do not equate endorsement (or agreement in doctrine) and fellowship. I may not endorse the use of instrumental music in worship or premillennialism, but I can nonetheless have fellowship with *all* those who are in the Lord.

This is a good place to stress the fact that there is a big difference between the church of the Lord and the Restoration Movement. Many in the "denominations" are in the one body of Christ, but they may not be restoration-minded. And many among the disciples are no longer a part of the Movement that brought them into existence, but they are still in the church of Christ. But there *is* a Restoration Movement with the catholic church of Christ, and I count myself a part of it. This is why I work with all disciple churches. They hold the Restoration as the goal. If there were no disciple churches, I would work among other Christians that I might be in sympathy with restoration principles. And in that context, whether among Baptists or Methodists, I would continue to work for reformation. I would remind my Alabama brother that the great Restoration Movement emerged within the denominations, and it was there that it worked like yeast, and who knows but what things would be much better if it had remained with the ones who gave it birth rather than to separate itself and become another church. I am still looking for the authority for one group of Christians separating from another group.

*Restoration Review*, Vol. 1:(1959), p. 63f.

We do not feel that this needs any lengthy comment. The "three denominations" which Dr. Garrett says have emerged from the Restoration Movement he lists as the Disciples, the Christian Church, and the Church of Christ. By the Disciples, of course, he means the churches which have fellowship with the International Convention of the Disciples of Christ and the multiple organizations making up the United Christian Missionary Society. This is a confessed denomination. It glories, in fact, in its denominational status and has all the implimentation of denominationalism. In theology it has abandoned the plea of restoration. Surely Dr. Garrett knows this. This group over the period of the last seventy-five years have adopted the extreme positions of liberal, old line modernism and for them the Scriptures long since ceased to be a standard of authority in religion. It is senseless to talk about restoration of the New Testament if there is not a pattern in the New Testament for that restoration. That that position has been abandoned by this group may be documented, e. g., in Dr. W. E. Garrison's book *Religion Follows the Frontier*, where the thesis is that no such thing as a restoration is possible. Most of those in this group believe in neither the divine origin of the Bible or the Gospel; they do not believe in the deity of Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 6:15). Yet Brother Garrett fellowships them and says that they are a part of the Restoration Movement.



The second group in Dr. Garrett's list is the Christian Church, a designation which fits a somewhat heterogeneous group. While some in the Disciples' group would call themselves by this name, it generally describes those who stand half-way between the Restoration Movement of the early nineteenth century before the introduction of the instrument and the other innovations and the Disciples' Denomination. These churches under the influence of men like Isaac Errett at first adopted the innovations such as the Society, the instrument, the pastor system instead of the plurality of local ruling elders, etc., but around the turn of the century many of them realized the direction of events and broke with the united organ which was headed toward denominationalism. These people generally resisted the encroachment of destructive higher criticism and at present continue to hold forth the Bible as the Word of God and the New Testament as a pattern of authority for a restoration of the church. Specifically they scorn denominationalism and are autonomous in their local congregations. As Brother Garrett knows, they plead for undenominational Christianity.

The other group Dr. Garrett calls the " 'Church of Christ' group." By this we presume he means the group which nurtured him. He says that like the Disciples they are a denomination. We think that Bro. Garrett knows better than this and that he is perfectly capable of representing the viewpoint of the group with which he once stood correctly should he wish to do so. We wonder if he thinks that undenominational Christianity is possible and if so how he would explain the fact to a denominationalist. Surely he has preached the plea hundreds of times.

It is true that early in the movement Thomas Campbell organized the Christian Association of Washington, Pa., which he hoped would work among different denominations as societies within the different sects. But what he hoped to accomplish through this was the abolition of these sects by getting them to abandon such sectarian devices as creeds, human names, denominational ordination of preachers, and all things in matters of faith and practice for which they could not find a "thus saith the Lord." When it became apparent that the denominations intended to have none of that program they organized (not "a church of Christ Group" but) churches of Christ. When they abandoned denominational machinery and dissolved the Mahoning Association in 1831 their status became non-denominational and they called upon people to come out of the sects and join them on a platform of New Testament Christianity. When the sixteen churches or so that had formed the "Springfield Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church" wrote their last Will and Testament and merged with the body of Christ at large, did they become a "Church of Christ Group" in so doing? Is our plea different today?

We are quite sure that there are people who denominationalize this plea, who think of themselves as being a "Church of Christ Denomination." But we think that Bro. Garrett knows that this type person does not understand and does not represent the plea.

Dr. Garrett's *Restoration Review* carries a book review of a book<sup>1</sup> by Mrs. John O'Dowd which seems to parallel the path which he himself has trod to wherever it is that he has "gone." Having heard some of the type of preaching to which she was constantly subjected for twenty-five years we do not wonder that she considered it a low caloric spiritual diet and turned to something else. But neither do we think that it is typical of the preaching of most Gospel preachers. Dr. Garrett himself was once a prime example of this type of dogmatic radicalism and psychologically his change like hers is probably a reaction. Several years ago a group of brethren out in California began to put out this same kind of talk and Bro. G. C. Brewer took notice of them and their charge that the Restoration Movement had resulted in another denominational group. His little book is called *As Touching Those Who Were Once Enlightened*. It is a jewel and a perfect answer to such nonsense.

It is true that the great preachers of the 19th Century Restoration Movement continued to hold that there were Christians in denominations and to "work with them" at least to some extent. Mostly they worked to get them to abandon denominationalism. And they did not believe the way to do it was to extend fraternal recognition which would leave the impression that those in that condition were pleasing to God.

It is also true that one does not have to "agree" in all points with those whom he endorses. There is certainly a realm of opinion and expediency where there is and ought to be liberty. This is cardinal to the Restoration plea. This is where most of the fission spoken of in the churches of Christ has occurred. The existence of the differences in the realm of opinion and method need not have occasioned disruption of fellowship if those adopting them as matters of faith had not themselves cut themselves off from their brethren. The cutting off was done by the groups themselves (except in individual cases where the advocating of method for law became a question of faction). The existence of such fission while regrettable does not invalidate the plea for unity. This position, also, we think Dr. Gar-

---

<sup>1</sup>Margaret Edson O'Dowd, *In the Great Hand of God I Stand*, (1958) \$2.00. The book is reviewed by Cleona Harvey and headed, "Revolt to 'Church of Church of Christ-ism'." The book records the reason for Mrs. O'Dowd's leaving the church of which she was a member for twenty-five years. *Restoration Review*, Vol. I, No. 1 (1959), pp. 57-60.

rett understands well and has many times explained in his own preaching.

We agree thus that fellowship does not always imply endorsement. It does not in the realms mentioned above; but it does in doctrine and faith. Paul showed that the Apostles gave him the right hand of fellowship only when they ascertained that the doctrines they preached were the same (Gal. 2:1-10). If Bro. Garrett has "gone" so far that he would work with all these groups, and would even work among the denominations he mentioned, one wonders just whom he would not fellowship or work among.

We continue to believe that churches of Christ represent a sincere and logical effort at reproducing Biblical churches in the midst of a divided religious world. We are sure that they stand upon Biblical ground, when their historic positions are rightly understood, not caricatured. Bro. Garrett on the whole was once an able exponent of this plea. We don't know where he has "gone to," but we are sorry to see him go.—THE EDITOR.



# A Further List of Theses Written by Members of the Church of Christ

Compiled by Alex Humphrey, Jr.

The following is a continuation of the list of Theses at various schools prepared by members of churches of Christ. These studies are available at the libraries where the degrees were granted. They may usually be borrowed on inter-library loan.

## FROM GEORGE PEPPERDINE COLLEGE

- Bennett, Weldon B. "A Historical Study of the Lord's Supper in the Pre-Catholic Period." M.A., 1947
- Brage, James. "A Critical Study of Expository Preaching as Set forth in Lectures, Homiletical Texts, Biographies of Great Expositors, and Other Works on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons." M.A., 1949
- Burkholder, Harold Delbert. "The Origin and Development of the Congregations of the Pacific District Conference of Mennonites." M.A., 1949
- Butler, Harry A. "The Ante-Nicene Exegesis of the Pastoral Epistles." M.A., 1952
- Cannon, Russell Carroll. "The Idea of the Holy Spirit in the Pauline Epistles." M.A., 1948
- Carruthers, Kenneth Linton. "Jonathan Edwards' Idea of the Holy Spirit." M.A., 1948
- Ellis, Lloyd Eugene. "A Study of First Century Baptism." M.A., 1947
- Fox, Harry Robert. "Paul's Conception of the Atonement." M.A., 1949
- Johnson, William H. "Augustine's Conception of Sin." M.A., 1950
- Jones, Joseph Ferdinand. "The Doctrine of the Church in the Pauline Epistles." M.A., 1947
- Kernan, John. "A Comparison of Society and Non-Society Mission Effort Within the Restoration Movement." M.A., 1949
- Key, Roy C. "An Exposition of Christian Faith." M.A., 1946
- Klein, Harry R. "The Atonement in the Epistles." M.A., 1951
- Lockhart, Stanley A. "Christian Hymns in the Primitive Church." M.A., 1957

- Merritt, Bruce Curtis. "The Place of Prayer in the Life of Jesus." M.A., 1957
- Palmer, Roy V. "A Historical Study of Singing in the Early Church." M.A., 1946
- Rogers, Noble Lloyd. "The Concept of Law in the Pauline Epistles." M.A., 1947
- Ross, Joel E. "Romans XVI, 17-18 in the Light of the Early Church and Its Times." M.A., 1951
- Schneider, Delwin B. "Charis in the Non-Pauline Writings of the New Testament." M.A., 1950
- Thomas, Hugh S. "The Diaconate in the Church of the New Testament." M.A., 1948
- Thompson, Fred P. "The Christology of Justin Martyr." M.A., 1951

#### FROM EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY, PORTALES

- Baggett, Richard Frederick. "Intercommunication Among New Testament Churches." M.A., 1950
- Carver, Edgar Leroy. "Teaching Methods of Jesus." M.A., 1951
- Chester, Ray F. "A Study of the Relationship of Certain Symbols of the Apocalypse to the Old Testament." M.A., 1952
- Davis, Fred. L. "The New Testament Idea of Fellowship." M.A., 1956
- Degge, Eldon Howell. "The End of the Jewish Kingdom, 640-586 B.C." M.A., 1954
- Eckstein, Stephen Daniel, Jr. "The Effect of Gnosticism on the First and Second Century Church." M.A., 1950
- Hamilton, John M. "Luther's Philosophy of Education." M.A., 1951
- Harper, William Sidney Gene. "A Critical Evaluation of Theories for Interpreting Revelation." M.A., 1950
- Kay, Clarence Lloyd. "History of the Fourth Street Church of Christ in Portales, New Mexico, 1900-1953." M.A., 1953
- Marshall, Murray M. "The Use of the Books of the New Testament by the Early Christian Writers, Clement of Rome, Polycarp of Smyrna, and Irenæus of Lyons." M.A., 1950
- Reese, Grady Lee. "A Survey of the Preaching Habits of Ministers of the Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Nazarenes, Churches of Christ and Episcopalians in New Mexico." M.A., 1951

- Rhodes, H. Kenneth. "History of the Church of Christ in Artesia, New Mexico. M.A., 1958
- Russo, Nicola. "A Relating of Certain Teachings of Irenæus, Tertullian, and Cyprian to the Historical Background of Their Time." M.A., 1953
- Shelburne, Carl Francis. "To What Extent Did Alexander Campbell Use Education in the Restoration Movement?" M.A., 1951
- Smith, Jay J. "The Theological Basis of the Reformation." M.A., 1954
- Sofford, Eugene V. "History of the Farwell, Texas, Community, 1905-1952." (Includes a history of the church of Christ): M.A. 1955
- Van Scoder, Lauren R. "The History of Education in the Lockney Public Schools, Lockney, Texas, 1890-1953." (Includes some information about Lockney Christian College), M.A., 1953
- Warren, Norman LaGrand. "Relationships of the Rural Church and Its Problems in the Community." M.A., 1957
- Wright, William Lloyd. "Philosophy and Status of Chairs of Religion in Texas and New Mexico." M.A., 1951

#### FROM ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

- Correction: In an earlier listing the following two theses were confused:
- Oglesby, Robert Kerry. "A History of the Interpretation of the Relationship of Faith and Works." M.A., 1956
- Music, Goebel. "The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews." M.A., 1956

#### FROM BUTLER UNIVERSITY, INDIANAPOLIS

- Bobo, David H. "A Study of Words Common to Both Hebrew and Greek." B.D., 1955
- Decker, William Bailey. "A Critical Analysis of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians." M.A., 1951
- Hobbs, A. G. "A Critique of 'The Secret of Happiness' by Rabbi David Miller." M.A., 1950
- Jennings, Alvin. "T. M. Allen, Pioneer Preacher of Missouri and Kentucky." M.A., 1951



- Johnson, Robert Lee. "Love (Agape) as a Unique Element in the New Testament." M.A., 1949
- Merritt, Roy Dean. "A Study of the Acceptance as Scripture by Christians and Jews of Certain Non-Canonical Jewish Books." M.A., 1951
- West, Earl Irvin. "Life and Times of David Lipscomb." Th.M., Butler, 1953
- West, Earl Irvin. "Historical Background of the Thirty-Nine Articles." M.A., 1945
- West, Earl Irvin. "History of the Churches of Christ (1849-1906)." B.D., 1948
- Whitson, Mont. "Campbell's Conception of the Millennium." M.A., 1951
- Womack, Morris M. "A Study of Heresies in the Second Century." M.A., 1958

#### FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

- Bonner, Elizabeth Mary. "A Study of the Church of Christ in Texas." M.A., 1941.
- Clark, Nimrod Lafayette. "Greek Prepositions of the New Testament." M.A., 1914.
- Cubstead, Lane. "*The Firm Foundation*: The History of a Pioneer Religious Journal and Its Editors. Master of Journalism, 1957.
- Ewing, George Wilmeth. "A Study of the Frontier Preacher in Texas." M.A., 1952
- Fullerton, Raymon Dawkin, Jr. "Public Relations Practices of Selected Church-Related Colleges: An Evaluation." M.A., 1951
- Hicks, Olan Lavelle. "Gilbert Keith Chesterton, Essayist and Controversialist." M.A., 1935
- McGlothlin, Ray, Jr. "A Historical and Grammatical Introduction to First Peter." M.A., 1951
- Payne, Harry Edward. "Studies in the Pastoral Epistles." M.A., 1943

#### FROM SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY

- Hailey, Homer. "Attitudes and Consequences in the Restoration Movement." M.A., 1944
- Spain, Robert Carl. "The Pastoral Epistles." M.A., 1946
- Thomas, James David. "A History of the Doctrine of the Inspiration of the Scriptures." M.A., 1944

## Notes on Recent Happenings and Contributions

*New Testament Textual Finds.* The past year was one of significant discovery in the field of the New Testament text. Dr. Bruce M. Metzger reviews the happenings of 1958 in this area in an article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* of March, 1959. The outstanding finds were:

(1) Discovery of the rest of the Bodmer II Papyrus MS of the Gospel of John. The remains of the first fourteen chapters were found in 1956. Now the extant fragments of all twenty-two chapters of the Gospel are known. The MS dates according to authorities from cir. 200 A.D. It has been called the earliest extant copy of any considerable part of the Greek New Testament. It is designated P<sup>66</sup>.

(2) Discovery of Bodmer MS III, a copy of John and the opening chapters of Genesis in the Bohairic dialect (the Coptic version of the Bible). It is dated by the finder in the fourth century and throws the date of this important translation of the N. T. back several centuries. Significantly the suspected passages of John (John 5:3b-4 and 7:53-8:11) are not in the version.

(3) Discovery of the Crosby Codex, which contains several documents. One of these is the book of Jonah from the O. T. and the text of 1 Peter in the Sahidic dialect of Egypt. The document is datable according to its discoverer in the third century which would make it older than any previously known copy of 1 Peter, not even excepting the Greek.

(4) Identification of significant portions of Tatian's Diatessaron, (a harmony of the four Gospels originally in Greek) quoted in a Syriac MS commentary of Ephraem on the work. It was the discovery of a Greek fragment of this harmony in the 1930's that proved its existence and made the late dating of John (which had been the cornerstone of some critical evaluations of John) impossible.

All of which shows that the field of textual studies of the N. T. is still a very exciting field. We are still in a period of valuable discovery and the last word in the critical problems of the New Testament cannot be yet said. All discoveries tend to add greater weight to the confidence that the students of the N. T. have that it is the best attested document by many times of all antiquity.

### *The Gnostic Documents from Chenoboskion.*

The middle of the decade 1940-50 produced two astounding discoveries, completely beyond the expectation of the most optimistic hunter of antiquities. One from the coves of the Dead Sea and the other from a place in upper Egypt called Nag-Hamadi in the region of Chenoboskion. That the world has heard more of the Dead Sea

Scrolls is not that they are of more possible importance, but because the Nag-Hamadi documents unfortunately were claimed in such a hunter of antiquities. One from the caves of the Dead Sea and the way that they are just now for the most part being edited and studied.

The discovery consisted of thirteen Manuscripts, containing in all some 49 works of which some five are duplicates of others. They are in the Sahidic dialect or a sub-dialect of that language, the subakhminic, and are the remains of a library of a Gnostic Sect.

One MSS of this lot containing five documents was acquired in the late 40's by the Jung foundation of Zurich, the description and finally the text (indicating the nature of the entire find and affording some preliminary conclusions) were made known to the scholarly world largely through the Journal *Vigiliae Christianae*. A description and evaluation has appeared in the U. S. edited by F. L. Cross, Jr., *The Jung Codex* (London, Morehouse-Gorham, 1955). The most complete description is a recent book by the scholar who has had a great part in processing the find, Jean Doresse. The book is entitled *les livres secrets des gnostiques d'egypte*, or *The Secret Books of the Gnostics of Egypt*. The books have already partly been published in photographic reproductions, with translations, and eventually all of them will be available.

The significance of these books is that they throw much light on the history of the conflict of the early church within itself. It has long been known that in the second century the church found itself in a fight to death with a philosophical sect which tried to fasten a re-interpretation of the gospel on the church. This re-interpretation was based upon dualism and included a denial of the incarnation of Jesus. The movement drew the opposition of such writers as Irenæus, Origin, and Justin. Hitherto we have known these people largely from those who refuted them. The authorities in this field have contended that the picture presented in these defenders of the faith with regard to their enemies was overdrawn and unrealistic. Now suddenly we are present with a whole library of authentic documents from which to judge them.

The results, according to preliminary reports, is that the picture in the anti-heretical writings of the early Christians was not overdrawn. The Gnostic Movement has touched even directly on the study of the New Testament because of seeming refutation of at least an incipient Gnosticism in such books as the Gospel of John, Colossians, and the Pastoral Epistles. It has been the plea of some scholars that a definite identification of Gnosticism in these books will place the composition of them well down into the second century and make their genuineness impossible, because of the lateness of



origin of the Jewish-Christian Gnostic movement. The Nag-Hamadi documents date from the fourth century, but they are translations of Greek documents, some of them actually known and mentioned by writers of the second century and on the whole they imply a much earlier dating of the originals as well as an earlier dating of the influence of the movement than has been held, at least according to some who have studied them. We shall know more later.

*The Gospel According to Thomas.* One of the Chenoboskion documents is an apocryphal gospel known as the *Gospel of Thomas*. It has been in the limelight lately by virtue of announcements in the press of the discovery in Egypt of "another Gospel containing sayings of Jesus hitherto unknown." The French scholar Cullmann in a recent visit to this country made reference to some of the contents in a lecture at Union Theological Seminary and the matter was picked up by the wire associations.

The document is a group of 114 "sayings" attributed to Jesus. It turns out that the first lines of this work are identical with the Greek papyrus known as the Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus. According to a recent article in the *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* by Pierre Prigent entitled "The Gospel according to Thomas, the State of the Question" several of the sayings are recognized from patristic quotations from such apocryphal books as *The Gospel of the Hebrews, of the Nazarenes, and of the Ebionites*. Others bear resemblance to the Pseudo-Clementine Epistles. Many similarities are noted from the Diatessaron of Tatian. Some sayings are dependent on our Gospels. In its quotations from the Canonical Biblical books it very frequently is said to favor the readings of Codex Bezae. According to Prigent some sayings "seem to be considered as witnesses of a primitive tradition anterior to the synoptic tradition of the canonical gospels." In other words, it is thought that a few of the sayings might be reflections of actual words of Jesus. It is this possibility which excites people, just as it did earlier when the Oxyrhynchus sayings were published. One might suppose that sayings of Jesus did exist which were not a part of our Four Gospels, for example, just as Paul recorded a saying of Jesus in Acts 20:35 that is not a part of the Gospels. But the unreliability of the source of this information, the rejection of these books by the early church itself, together with the obvious nature of this literature with its purpose of putting into the mouth of Jesus and the apostles teaching which would favor the Gnostic conception of Christ, render it unlikely that a Christian could ever have any assurance that the sayings are genuine.

# Book Reviews

By Pat Harrell

**The Story of the Church.** By A. M. Renwick. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959 (paper), 222 pp. \$1.25.

Dr. A. M. Renwick, Professor of Church History in Edinburgh's Free Church College, has written a first class survey of Church History. He has the ability to come to the heart of the matter in a few words, and his arrangement of material makes for clarity in reading. Important events from the church's beginning on Pentecost until the present day are covered—twenty centuries in two hundred pages. The major criticism of the book belongs as much to the nature of surveys as to this particular work. There are some things we wish were included or covered in more detail. The problem of selection is further complicated by the fact that the book was originally written for a British audience. The Restoration movement and other forces on the American scene are passed by. The church member who desires an introduction to Church History, or the minister who needs a quick review, can not do better than to start with *The Story of the Church*. Both the price and the organization make this volume suitable for the church's educational program.

**The First Epistle General of Peter, Tyndale Commentary Series.** By Alan M. Stibbs. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 192 pp. \$3.00.

**The Acts of the Apostles, Tyndale Commentary Series.** By E. M. Blaiklock. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 197 pp. \$3.00.

These two volumes represent the latest releases in the Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Works on James, Thessalonians, The Pastorals, and Corinthians have already appeared. The series is based on the King James text, partially because of its general use, and partially because it is the easiest way to show the superiority of other translations. So far the series has achieved what is very rare in commentaries—it is popular enough to be used and scholarly enough to be useful.

The difficult problems of First Peter are dealt with very satisfactorily by Stibbs. Continually using the works of Beare and Selwyn as foils to develop his own position, the author advocates a Petrine origin (with an assist from Silvanus), an early date of AD 63 or 64 (the persecutions are not parallel to Pliny's situation), and an epistolary form. A third of commentary is given over to these mat-

ters of introduction. A welcomed bonus is a section summarizing the theology of the epistle.

Dr. Blaiklock's commentary on Acts discusses paragraphs rather than verses, with key words and textual matters treated under "additional notes" at the end of each section. In addition to a long section dealing with the "World of the Book" in the chapter on Introduction, the author, who is a Professor of Classics, richly employs background material throughout the volume. In addition to its worth as a popular commentary, it is especially rewarding for the expositor preacher.

**The Psychology of Christian Conversion.** By Robert O. Ferm. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1959. 255 p. \$4.00.

Every thinking Christian, at some time or another, has probably wondered about the psychological phenomenon of conversion. What are the inner processes involved when a person accepts Christ? To answer this question is Dr. Ferm's task. He begins his work by giving a brief historical and critical survey of previous psychological studies of conversion, including William James, Edwin Starbuck, Gordon Allport among others. Man has the psychological capacity, the author shows, for the evangelical crisis of conversion. The evangelical crisis is defined as, "that moment in the experience of regeneration when the individual, knowingly, commits himself through faith to Jesus Christ as both Saviour and Lord." The crisis is not the same for every person. There is the Intellectual Type, the Emotional Stimulus Type, and the Moral Type.

A problem is that the *psychological experience* of Christian conversion is no different from conversion in other religions. Dr. Ferm finds the uniqueness of Christian conversion in the content which gave rise to the crisis. In the case of Martin Luther the thunderstorm caused him to think about eternal things. This was the beginning which led to an intellectual problem about salvation which eventually led to his comprehending that "the righteous shall live by faith." There can be a crisis without content and content without crisis, but neither are genuine conversion. That Christian conversion requires both is a central thesis of the book.

There is a rewarding chapter on the problem of adolescence and conversion and interesting insights gathered by the author through the use of questionnaires. The reader will not agree with certain theological presuppositions of Dr. Ferm, but he will be benefited by this attempt to understand the psychology of conversion.

**Design for Christian Marriage.** By Dwight Hervey Small. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1959. 221 pp. \$3.50.



Another volume can be added to the growing body of literature available to the marriage counselor. This book, written by a minister who has specialized on the study for several years, covers areas of both courtship and marriage. The marriage of Christians is unique in the idea of "oneness" and in the relationship to Christ as the center of the home. The work is ideal to recommend to a couple contemplating matrimony and deserves a place in every church library.

**Between the Testaments.** By Charles F. Pfeiffer. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959. 132 pp. \$2.95.

Dr. Pfeiffer, Professor of Old Testament at Boston's conservative Gordon Divinity School, has written a short introduction to the Intertestamental Period. The book is divided into two sections which deal respectfully with the Persian and the Hellenistic Periods. His primary concern is with events, and consequently Jewish religion (although there is a short excursus on the synagogue) is largely ignored. One of the most important aspect of this era, the Apocalyptic Literature, is also slighted. The advantages of the work are that it is popular in style, which makes it ideal for a church library, and that it is written in an expanded outline form, which makes it ideal for class study.

**Calvin's Doctrine of the Knowledge of God.** By T. H. L. Parker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 129 pp. \$3.00.

Appropriately enough for the 450th anniversary of Calvin's birth, Eerdmans has added another volume to its already impressive list of works on the Genevan Reformer. T. H. L. Parker, who is known for his delightful and vivid *Portrait of Calvin*, writes to ascertain Calvin's position toward natural theology. His scholarly work is presented against the background of the dispute between Karl Barth and Emil Brunner. The author concludes that while Calvin made some allowance for the knowledge of God through natural theology, this knowledge alone will lead one further away from the true God. Nature, without the revelation of God in Christ, can only result in the worship of a god conceived in man's mind. The volume originally appeared in Great Britain, where it received acclaim, in 1952. It will be a welcomed contribution to those who are interested in the theology of Calvin or the neo-orthodox movement.

**Sacramental Teaching and Practice in the Reformation Churches.** By C. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957. 111 pp. \$1.50.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the subjects of a study in the Pathway Book Series. More of an exegetical investigation than a

historical survey, Dr. Bromiley does not present the Lutheran position. The readers of the *Quarterly* will not agree with his interpretation of baptism, which is perhaps all the more reason for reading it. His chapters on "The Real Presence" and "The Eucharistic Sacrifice" are the most stimulating in the section dealing with the Supper.

**The Defence of the Gospel in the New Testament.** By F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959. 105 pp. \$1.50.

On his visit to America last year, Britain's distinguished scholar, F. F. Bruce, gave in various places the five lectures which appear in this Pathway Book. The New Testament itself reflects the gospel being defended againth Judaism, Paganism, the Roman Empire (including the writings of Luke and the Apocalypse), and Pseudo-Christianity (Legalism, Gnosticism, Docetism). Bruce suggests that the study of New Testament apologetics will reveal the line along which the faith should be defended today.

**The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision.** Edited by Guy F. Hershberger. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1957. 360 pp. \$4.50.

One of the most fascinating movements in all of Church History is the sixteenth century Anabaptist (see this reviewer's introduction to the movement in Vol. III, No. 1 of *Restoration Quarterly*). Called Anabaptist (re-baptizer) by their opponents, they advocated the restoration of the New Testament church and ethic. Although there were contributing factors, the movement was largely the result of a spontaneous combustion caused by the contact of the Bible in the vernacular with pious hearts. The conflagration, fanned by a zeal not seen since the first century, quickly spread throughout Western Europe. By means of persecution, Protestant and Catholics were eventually able to extinguish the blaze save for a few smoldering embers.

This volume is a tribute to the outstanding Mennonite scholar, Harold S. Bender, who dedicated much of his life to the study of the Anabaptist theme. It includes twenty-four penetrating essays on the movement by authoritative scholars. These are related to four main focal points: research on the Anabaptists, their rise, their theology, and their contributions to history.

Of special interest in the latter category is "The Anabaptist's Contribution to History" written by Yale's Roland Bainton. Their belief in the separation of church and state, in a voluntary church, and in religious liberty were aspects that later generations had to rediscover. He presents a poignant criticism of religious withdrawals from the world. Ernest Payne, a leading Baptist of Great Brit-



ain, shows the similarities between the Anabaptist and the English radicals. He places the Disciples of Christ in the group representing Anabaptist ideals. In the closing essay Professor Paul Peachey weighs the problem of recapturing the Anabaptist vision. Especially provocative are his comments about the difficulty involved when a creative movement begins to crystallize into a cultural tradition.

It has only been in recent years that the Left Wing of the Reformation has received adequate treatment at the hands of the historians. This fact alone would warrant a wide reading of *The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision*. The added fact that the Anabaptist afford a means of appraisal of the Restoration motif, makes it a must for those interested in the American Restoration Movement.

**I Believe in Jesus Christ.** By Walter Russell Bowie. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. pp. 80. \$1.25.

In a popular style the author presents something of the character and work of Jesus and the significance the living Christ has for the modern world. This volume is another addition to the "Know Your Faith" series written for the average church member. Those familiar with his other works will need no other recommendation than the fact that this is from the pen of Walter Russell Bowie.

**The Sign of the Cross.** By O. P. Kretzmann. Saint Louis: The Concordia Publishing House, 1959. pp. 86. \$1.25.

Although these sermons were arranged for the "Lenten Season," their message is appropriate in every season. These nine sermons, printed in a paperback edition, are short, crisp, and Bible-centered. The author has the ability to employ illustrations in such a manner as to allow the illumination to penetrate the sermon, without the glare of verbosity.

**Adults at Worship.** By Wallace Fridy. Nashville: The Abingdon Press, 1959. pp. 128. \$1.75.

Here are twenty-three devotions written by a man gifted in the ability to create inspirational literature. Each lesson is drawn from the author's wide experience in life and literature and is accompanied by appropriate Scripture readings, suggested hymns, and prayers. The average reader will find that the devotions have the capacity both to humble and exalt. The minister will also find a rich mine of illustrative material.

**Teachers' New Testament With Notes and Helps.** John William Russell (ed.), Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1959. pp. 656. \$3.95.



Originally published by Nelson in 1912, *The Teachers' New Testament* is now reprinted by Baker. It contains the text of the American Standard Version with introductions to each book and explanatory notes on difficult verses. The notes are written with care to avoid denominational bias and consequently are sometimes not as pointed as one might wish. On the whole, however, it is an excellent help to study and far superior to many popular one-volume commentaries on the New Testament. Its worth has been proved by over half a century in service.

**Minister's Library Handbook.** By Jay J. Smith. Boston: W. A. Wilde Company, 1959. pp. 148. \$2.50.

As every minister knows, the difference between a mediocre preacher and a good preacher is often the matter of private study. But with the press of other duties encroaching upon his study time, frequently the preacher is left with only his good intentions. For the myriad of ministers who recognize the need, but are frustrated in their attempts to study, Jay Smith has written a most timely book. In detail he discusses the value of books, the concept of a library, the planning of a library, the selection of books, how to find desired books, organization of a library, and the place of study. Not the least of this book's value is in the lists the author gives to help the reader secure additional information. Although the subject is mentioned, it is unfortunate that he did not give more attention to the importance of religious journals and quarterlies in the minister's library. Jay Smith needs no introduction; he is a contributor to the *Restoration Quarterly* (Vol. II, No. 2), a minister for the church in Nashville, and Editor of the *Christian Family Book Club*. His book is recommended reading for every preacher sensitive to the need for study and is a must for every ministerial student.

**From Tragedy to Triumph.** By H. L. Ellison. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1958. pp. 127. \$2.50.

This book is concerned with the message of Job. Dr. Ellison, who is perhaps best known for his comments on the books of Kings and Chronicles in the *New Bible Commentary*, writes with clarity on one of the most difficult books in the Bible. Although he is aware of textual and language problems, his chief interest is with the heart of the message and its relevance for the present age. His comments, like Job's, are reflective of a period of personal suffering. If one's knowledge of Job is limited, this is an ideal book with which to begin one's study.